THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume X NOVEMBER 1924 Number 4

TRAINING SPEAKERS FOR CONFERENCE*

ALFRED DWIGHT SHEFFIELD
Wellesley College

TEACHERS of public speaking have always deserved well of the republic, for they are really occupied with the technique of democracy. And in the long course of democratic developments they have seen the shaping of three types of political expression, befitting three distinct types of organized public procedure. These three expressive modes are oratory, debate, and discussion.

Oratory is the voice of the mass meeting. It aims to focus and make articulate "the will of the people." Debate is the mode of the forum: it aims at a winning vote. Discussion is the mode of group conference: it aims at collaborative action. As a definite concerted performance, with expressive principles of its own, discussion is but just emerging into notice, but it so befits the process of adjustment between organized interests that it is likely to become the characteristic form of semi-public speaking in the conduct of twentieth century affairs. There seems hardly warrant to believe, as certain of its enthusiasts declare, that it will *supplant* debate. Some disputes, in the nature of the case, fall into two-sided line-ups, and where the deliberating group is large and pressed by business, it is almost driven to take up issues, not where discussion takes them—farther up stream, with the disputants in a mood of experimenting with experience—but canalized into alternatives calling for a showdown of choice. Still, in the field of social conflicts—the field now

*Read at the joint meeting of the Eastern and New England Conferences at Harvard University, April 11, 1924.

getting brought under the psychological scrutiny of Holt, Dewey, Krabbe, Follett, Lindeman, and others—the future is with discussion.

Three recent conferences in which the present writer took part displayed the distinctive features of discussion. One was a conference at Brookwood on the aim of workers' education. The speaking disclosed four points of view toward the issue. The worker of the politically minded, class-conscious type plainly thought that learning for the worker should be offered as ammunition for the class struggle. Against this view the college teacher protested that learning was not propaganda but a heritage of liberal culture, which the worker should be invited to share. The practically minded union official urged against both that the first worry about wage-earners was not the motive they *ought* to have but the motive they did have, which was the desire of diversion after the day's work, and that the teachers must put a little jazz into their classes if they would keep the workers there.

The second conference was a council made up of representatives from a number of peace organizations: The Foreign Policy Association, the Association for International Conciliation, the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, the National Council for Prevention of War, the Pan-American Union, the Church Peace Union, etc. There was perfect agreement on peace as the end of their endeavors, but no agreement on the means. Talk about means soon brought to the fore other desires in the situation than the Christian aversion to bloodshed and the taxpayer's concern over armament. There was the desire for security, the urge of pride in national power, and the claim of our traders abroad for a place in the sun.

The third conference was a business group in which members of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, officials of the Fishermen's Union of the Atlantic, vessel owners, and wholesale dealers discussed a proposal to organize a Coöperative Association for the marketing of fish. The interests at stake here were the fishermen's desire for stability in their wages, the vessel owners' desire for an assured return on their investments, the wholesalers' desire to continue the arrangements by which they were reaping speculative profits, the retailers' desire for better merchandising and extension of markets, and the consumers' concern lest coöperative control should mean monopoly prices.

In these conferences the features that stood out were those that mark the essential nature of conference as group-thinking. First of all, there was not an audience but an all-participant group. This tended to keep the speaking less self-conscious and more responsible. With an audience the speaker can hardly help being swayed by an awareness that his hearers can be counted on to applaud a telling expression of their own views. With a group of participants each speaker becomes charged with a double responsibility: he is at least an informal representative of one point of view, and he is under an immediate urgency to understand the other points of view. The group has importance as showing in miniature the cross-section of a public situation, and the fortunes of its discussion represent real possibilities of action.

Secondly, the dispute was not two-sided but several-sided: there were as many sides as there were interests at stake. This tended to avert irrelevant combativeness. The speakers were there not to master opponents but to master a situation. Terms of praise and blame were avoided—this from a sense that reproach only stirs egoistic responses, and that a dispute gets further as a piece of social engineering if one assumes in one's opponents at least a latent regeneracy.

Thirdly, the aim of the deliberations was the achieving not of a winning vote but of a *solution*, a plan of joint action that should enlist everybody concerned. The interests were dealt with not as subjective sentiments but as what people *desired to do*, and the group seemed in each case to recognize that the outcome of its effort would be not a blue-print of fixed ends but ends into which ultimately the means would have wrought an unbidden will of their own—in short, that the whole situation was bound to change as it moved on. Agreement, therefore, meant a realistic agreement on steps of action, on action that would fit the present cross-purposes into coöperative behavior-patterns, and this not all at once but progressively.

Finally, the speaking tended to deal not with arguments but with *reasons*. The distinction is important. A man's arguments are the reasons that recite well. They do his heart credit, and his logical head. They are objective and intellectualistic, and invite either assent or rebuttal. His reasons are things that lie deeper. They are the meaning to him of his own experience, and they invite

first of all a real understanding. The "man convinced against his will" is one whose arguments have been refuted but whose reasons have not been touched. Where discussion dwells on reasons, in a spirit of mutual inquiry, it smokes out into the open various divisive assumptions and attitudes, and gets further towards clearing up a situation than where it dwells on arguments—which are pretty much the window-dressing of men's minds.

Such are the outstanding marks of discussion as compared with debate. As to its technique teachers of speech will have two questions to ask: (1) Does group conference take any special type of thought-sequence that *organizes* the speaking, as briefing organizes debate? (2) Does conference-speaking make any distinctive demands upon the expressive resources of the speakers? Unless these questions find affirmative answers, discussion would seem to be an affair of conversational impromptu. Its speakers might take to heart the Irishman's definition of tact—"sayin' on the shpot what next mornin' you wish you'd said"—but it would hardly afford scope for any definite training.

Conference does, in fact, move normally through three definite phases as a thought-process. The group must (1) face the situation; (2) identify the problem; (3) test proposals for a solution. The first step assures the *reality* of the discussion as springing from the experiences of the group; the second step discriminates the precise cross purposes that constitute the problem; the third step compares and appraises the constructive effects of alternative ways out. The scheme requires the chairman to be a sort of psychological bandmaster, exercising just so much direction as makes the group play up to its opportunities for mutual thought-enhancement. He should bring to the discussion a tentative outline in the form of a question-sequence that forecasts the likely course of the speaking. Thus in a recent discussion on "Labor's Responsibility in Production" the leader used the following outline:[1]

A. Questions to Assure Facing the Situation:
   1. What forms of lost production come within your experience? (Days laid off, labor turnover, waste of materials, lost motions, personal friction, etc.)

[1]For examples of more developed question-outlines see current issues of *The Woman's Press*, 600 Lexington Ave., N. Y., beginning September 1924.

2. What are leaders in the labor movement doing or proposing as action in this matter by organized labor?
   (Policies to "protect the worker"—B. & O. Plan—government supervision—worker's control.)
3. What are employers and others asking in the way of action in this matter by organized labor?

B. QUESTIONS TO GET AT THE ESSENTIALS OF THE PROBLEM:

4. What are the reasons offered for each of these lines of action?—As thus expressed, do they convey what the various parties *desire to see done?*
5. What are the reasons urged against each of these lines of action?
   (Caution the speakers on questions 4 and 5 not to fall into attacking and defending the reasons. What is wanted here is simply an accurate *understanding* of the various desires at stake.)
6. Which, of any, of the issues set by these conflicting reasons depend for their settlement on information from specialists?
7. Which must be settled ultimately by harmonizing diverse purposes? (The chairman should try to sum up the problem in a clear statement.)

C. QUESTIONS TO TEST PROPOSALS LOOKING TOWARDS A SOLUTION:

8. How does the *whole situation* as regards waste in production look from the point of view of each party to it? Just what does he expect to see happen to *all* the interests involved if his proposed line of action were carried out?
   (The chairman should note where, under the influence of this larger perspective, the speakers give a more discriminating reinterpretation of their interests.)
9. What practical alternatives of action now seem to be before us?
10. Are there any distinctions to be observed as to what action is appropriate to industrial agencies, and what to political agencies?
11. What suggested steps would enlist a maximum of coöperation from the parties to production?

If such an organization of group-thinking is to be taught, we shall need special teaching materials—preferably small pamphlets or leaflets that display social issues in a form that makes them quickly accessible to analysis. Two such pamphlets, dealing respectively with the question of "Recognizing the Union" and the question of the "Right to Strike," have been experimentally issued by the Association Press in New York. Each of them (1) briefly recounts an actual situation, (2) offers questions to invite a mutual inspection of the interests at stake, (3) supplies definitions of the technical terms needed, and (4) ends with questions to test various alternatives of action. The questions are interspersed with thought-provoking quotations of fact and responsible opinion. The

advantage of material of this sort is that it presents to the eye at once a picture of deliberative method. It is not a treatise but a program. It does not have to be read through before the discussion can profitably begin. The quotations serve simply as springboards from which the students can launch themselves. They give occasion for expression that discriminates between fact and opinion. Incidentally they afford effectively-phrased bits which the teacher can ask to have read aloud by students who seem shy about speaking. Through all the phases of a complex social controversy it preserves a map of the total situation.

Conference, again, does in fact make special demands upon the expressive resources of the speaker. Equally with debate it demands attention to the phrasing of accurate statement. It develops a sense not only for fact diction—as against surreptitious implications of praise and blame—but for fact-*tone* in speaking. Many people are practically disqualified for speaking that weighs alternatives of action, simply because they cannot express a view as *contingent* upon variable factors in the case. They can only affirm and deny. Their tone and phrasing conveys no intimation that what their opponents profess and pursue as their interests *under the present conditions of conflict* they might reinterpret more considerately under conditions inviting to joint endeavor. More than debate conference keeps the disputants busied with the phrasing not so much of formal definitions as of discriminations of ideas that divide people because they are emotionally charged. "Competition," for example, might be formally defined as "the effort to get what others are trying to get;" but if we stop with that in an ethical discussion, somebody will think he saves the day for competition simply by declaring for "competition in service." Somebody else must point out that even "competition in service" is an effort not only to serve surpassingly well—to *be* first in service, but to be *known as* first, so that the Christian competitor who would square his efforts with his ideals has, in the phrase of the street, "another think coming."

Much of the finesse of conference turns on our ability to keep

opponents talking without personal pique. Our expressive job here has been well expressed by Herbert Kelly:[2]

"Whatever difficulties or impossibilities a man's views seem to involve, we must at least begin with the assumption that he himself sees a way round, or a way through,—either he thinks he can evade the result, or he does not think the result objectionable. We are free to state any difficulty or objection we think is involved, and we may put it as an argument, but we must be careful that neither form of statement nor tone of voice shall imply that the otner man cannot answer. That, besides being bad manners, is bad policy, since it provokes the other man to invent an answer when otherwise he might have admitted the validity of the objection; and frank admissions are a great help. No position is entirely free from difficulties. No one should be expected to have anticipated all the difficulties of his position; and a mere dialectical triumph over a conferee upon a novel objection is altogether incompatible with the Conference spirit."

To some it will doubtless seem as if face to face conference were too personal and undramatic a performance to count as "public speaking." In answer one might venture an analogy from the history of fencing. Early sword-duels were dramatic affairs. There was much slashing and leaping about—with many flesh-wounds but rare fatalities. It took the fencing masters of Europe two centuries to learn that the really momentous business of a sword-blade was not its slashing cuts but its home thrust. With that discovery came the modern small-sword of triangular section and a really scientific sword-play. The modern fencing-bout, with the blades moving in small, swift circles, is not spectacular, but it represents a full mastery of what it means to "get the point."

Such a figure, however, does little justice to conference as the agency of group-adjustments. Those who will carry on its developments in a democratic technique will find their students roused by its possibilities, not as the cock-pit of smart egoistic rivalries but as the power-plant of social influence.

[2]*The Object & Method of Conference*, published by the World Conference on Faith & Order (Box 226 Boston, Mass.) See also the present writer's *A Coöperative Technique for Conflict* (Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York).

DEBATE AND THE WORLD WE LIVE IN.

JOSEPH A. MOSHER
College of the City of New York

IN taking a decided stand in support of various positions, are President Coolidge, Secretary Mellon, and other prominent speakers of the day setting a bad example to the youth of the nation? It would seem so if we are to accept the spreading view that discussion should be substituted for debate in all cases calling for deliberation. Debating, both as practiced in public life and taught in academic institutions, is being attacked on the ground that it tends to establish in the minds of participants and listeners the idea that a proposition is unqualifiedly true or false, necessary or unnecessary, right or wrong. It is further maintained that debating evokes the "fight image" by arousing a more or less fervid desire to overwhelm opponents without regard to reality, without concern for the interests of all factors involved in the subject under consideration. Debate is under fire as a method of procedure comparable to the knock-down-and-drag-out practices of the Middle Ages. As a desirable substitute for debate in public life and class-room, discussion is recommended. In following the latter method of handling a topic it would appear that a group of people come together without preconceived convictions, without bias; each person then, avoiding argument, contributes to the consideration of the subject in hand whatever material he may have, and listens to his collaborators with an open mind. In this way, it is averred, the "fight image" may be avoided and more helpful and fruitful conclusions reached.

Surely sincere educators and other forward-looking citizens would welcome any change which might tend to enlarge men's minds and to make the handling of life's problems more productive of the greatest good to the greatest number. If debating is subversive of these ends and discussion promotes them, the substitution should by all means be encouraged, provided the change is

feasible. Therefore some further consideration of this promising suggestion is undertaken with a view to examining the nature of topics to be handled, the functions of discussion and debate, the human factor in the matter, and in the light of these, the question of debate as an academic course.

I.

Discussion, always understood as a communing of disinterested, non-argumentative minds, plays a considerable part in life. As employed in ordinary conversation it bulks large in the world's utterance. From this relatively inconsequential type its use extends into the deliberations of clubs, associations, committees, and other assemblages up to gatherings of the greatest significance. For the most part, discussions are concerned with topics which, while permitting incidental differences of opinion, are not of a debatable character. Art, literature, music, history, etc., are replete with subjects of this kind. For instance, such topics as "The Poetry of Robert Frost," "Erich Korngold as an Operatic Composer," "Modern Staging," "The Basques of Today" do not necessarily arouse a clash of contending forces. Furthermore, even topics more fraught with debating possibilities, as in the fields of industry and politics, may be dealt with by groups of individuals sufficiently cultivated and unanimous in their views to preclude sharply drawn lines of opposition. In a world of universal culture, unanimity of view, and perfect altruism there would probably be no argument. Brookfarm and similar projects have been launched with such idyllic coöperation in mind.

But such a condition, apparently, presupposes a change in humanity and its institutions beyond the bounds of expectation if not of imagination. There *are* conflicting interests; there *are* sharp differences of opinion as to the best policies for the welfare of all concerned; there *are* questions which must be answered by "Yes" or "No." In many instances the parties concerned are amenable to adjustment of their differences through the good offices of an impartial adjudicator, and the necessity of presenting their respective cases, i. e., of debating, is thus obviated. Situations often arise, however, in which two or more conflicting interests, or policies, or conceptions of right and wrong, or estimates of relative value must face each other.

To cite some typical example. Shall Rev. Smith or Rev. Brown be called to fill a vacant pulpit? Both men have warm supporters on the church board. It is only natural and human that these two parties should present the cases for their respective candidates, should debate, in other words. And it is quite possible that as a result of the debate they may choose Rev. Jones as a compromise candidate. Again, shall the village of X issue bonds to pave Main Street? Some members of the town council say yes; others say that Main Street should not be paved; perhaps a third group agrees that the street should be paved, but that an increase in the tax rate should provide for the expenditure. Can debate be avoided after such a situation has arisen? Of course it may be said that men should never permit themselves to harbor a conviction; or, having entertained a conviction, that they ought never to express it in deliberation with other men. Well, that, it seems to me, not only over-stresses the danger of the "fight-image," but also flies in the face of human nature. Finally, should the Constitution of the United States be amended so as to provide for the abolition of child labor? As in the case of the previous examples such a topic usually reaches a clearly defined form of proposal only after consideration by individuals, by groups, by the press in many instances, has operated to crystallize the general situation into a statement indicating a more or less strongly supported course of action. By the same process opposing sentiment has been created. In other words the matter has become bilateral. Even at this stage there are, undoubtedly, some fine-minded people who can still consider the subject with a disinterested, Platonic attitude. And if the practical settlement of the problem could be indefinitely suspended, a persistent avoidance of taking sides, the discussing attitude, would be feasible. However, decisions have to be reached as to who shall fill pulpits, whether or not streets shall be paved and constitutions amended.

Thus we arrive at the weakness of discussion as a means of final arbitrament preliminary to action. The discussing attitude is fragmentary; it proceeds piecemeal; it is confusing; it lacks the solidity, the unity, the determining and propulsive force of the debating attitude. When action is called for, a discussion must almost of necessity assume the character of a debate; that is, the contributors must be lined up, balanced; the open minds

must finally be closed, harsh though it may sound. When action is called for, people must reach a point at which if they speak at all they must support a proposed action or oppose it. The latter attitude by no means implies a sheer negation. The negative side of a proposition frequently opposes because it favors a modification or an alternative position. This may be termed the constructive negative. The essential point is that while discussion may examine the virtues and defects, the various viewpoints, the involvements and implications of a proposition it does not supply the synthesis, the summarization, the balance of pros and cons which the debate affords as a means of clearing the way for final decision.

Unquestionably many futile debates are indulged in, including those Chautauquan bouts of "intellectual giants" who split the gate receipts behind the arras. There are probably a greater number of futile discussions. The former might be greatly reduced if merely contentious persons could be induced to turn over a new leaf. But the fact still remains that as a result of or in spite of discussion, clashes of opinion and conviction exist and will probably continue to exist, in which cases the impartial, philosophic view essential to discussion is hardly to be looked for. We may further maintain that for purposes of enabling participants, as well as non-participants, to evaluate the relative merits of a bilateral or multilateral case the debate is superior to the disjointed, confusing effect of the discussion, in which no one stands for anything.

II.

As has been pointed out, both discussion and debate have their functions in life. It is from this angle that the academic aspect of the matter is approached. For in dealing with so practical a subject as public speaking, teachers aim primarily to train students to act effectively outside of school and college. Unless that aim itself is questioned, the retention of debating in the curriculum is in great measure justified. We read, however, in an article in "The New Republic" by Professor Harry A. Overstreet of the College of the City of New York, that the place of debate "must be taken by a form of intellectual activity nearer to the realities and far more fertile for achievement." The form of intellectual activity referred to is discussion. Now, it is to be gravely

questioned whether discussion is either "nearer to the realities" or "more fertile for achievement." Incidentally, it is rather surprising that the writer, while condemning bilateralism and the "fight-image," should have taken so rigidly uncompromising a view of the subject. At the present time both debate and discussion (the latter usually catalogued as "extemporaneous speaking") are taught. And because of the varied usefulness of these courses in training students it would seem not only unnecessary but also undesirable to abolish either.

The academic course in discussion seeks to draw out the students' knowledge of various topics and to cultivate their ability to express their ideas before audiences. As a rule the procedure of the course accords with the ideals indicated by the proponents of discussion. Topics are announced beforehand so that the group which is to carry on the discussion may have a chance to prepare some ideas to contribute. Avoiding such a debate-provoking question as "Should labor unions be obliged to incorporate?" the form of these topics is of the approved non-commital type, such as "Labor Unions," "Our Island Possessions," etc. During an alloted hour from six to eight disinterested, coöperative students contribute their bits on some such topic. They, like the audience, in the words of Professor Overstreet, "have not come with any side to defend; they are free to 'taste' the intrinsic values of the points made." One advances the idea that labor unions have grown to great proportions in the last quarter century. He gives some interesting figures and speaks well and earnestly. The next student cleverly links up with his predecessor by bringing out the point that since labor unions have become so powerful it has been suggested that they should incorporate. The following student remarks that as has been indicated there is much to be said upon both sides of the incorporation feature, but that no one can withhold praise for the part which unions have played in raising wages and reducing hours of labor. Then comes up a student who gives an instructive comparison of labor unions with the earlier guilds. And so on. This sort of thing is good practice in extemporaneous speaking. It provides an increase of useful information. It affords opportunities to learn from one's colleagues and from the instructor who criticises both form and content. But like most discussions which have no definite goal, and which are carried on by

people who have nothing to contend for or oppose, it reaches no conclusion; it settles no problem.

The character of the course in debating is substantially different. It deals with specific proposals which have, through public presentation and discussion, aroused a division of opinion. The course requires the students to investigate the entire subject, to analyze the proposition into the salient factors involved, and to organize the case into a logical and convincing whole aimed to support a definite position. This position may be in favor of the proposed action, or against it, or for a modification or alternative. Considering the tendency of the mind to be satisfied with fragmentary ideas, to vacillate, to stray into incoherencies, irrelevancies, and fallacies of reasoning, such a course is of considerable value as mental training, and of even greater value, perhaps, in developing leadership.

Regarding the question of students being encouraged to seek the truth with regard to a problem rather than to win a victory, it may, I think, be fairly said that the winning or losing of a classroom debate is usually a matter of small moment to the students engaged. The effects of either, if indeed any teacher bothers to pick the winner, are too negligible to arouse concern on the part of the students, to say nothing of evoking the spectral "fight-image." Students do, it is true take some pride in presenting complete, clear, well-substantiated cases, if for no other reason than that their standing is thereby affected. As to the relative effectiveness of the courses in debate and discussion in encouraging students to get at the truth of a subject, what are the circumstances? It is to be noted that the subjects used in a debating class are stated in a form which connotes disagreement, *because such disagreement actually exists.* For example: "Should final examinations in college courses be abolished?" "Should the issuance of tax-exempt securities be ended?" "Should the United States withdraw from control of the Philippines by 1925?" When a student begins investigating one of these subjects he isn't encouraged to avoid debate if the subject is stated, for instance, "Tax-exempt securities and justice." This topic evidently suggests just what the original statement meant, although it might take considerable time for the average assemblage to arrive at a realization of the fact. In any event the facts bearing upon the subject will be quite likely to

necessitate a bilateral division of opinion. And the ultimate truth lies in a fair and thorough balancing of the pros and cons, just as it does when we consider whether or not to sublet our apartment for the summer.

Of course students might get just as much truth and keep out of the field of argument by using purely discussion subjects, such as "The Philippine Islands." Then we would have coöperative contributions about the geographical features, the population, the form of government, the native products, exports, etc. But that will not touch the problem which confronts the United States Government, and it will not be any more truthful. The affirmative speaker on any mooted topic realizes, to be sure, that in advancing the arguments for a certain course of action he is not exhausting the subject. His opponents, too, are aware of a corresponding effort to stress chiefly the arguments which support one or more variant solutions. This material might all be brought out by one student, or piecemeal by a number of students and if they carefully avoided advocacy of any solution the process might be called discussion. But that would not alter the sum-total of truth nor change the fact that the yes or no attitude maintained in the debating class is the only practicable position to assume on any such problem as, "Should the United States terminate control of the Philippines by 1925?" or "Should the United States Constitution be so amended as to provide for the abolition of child labor?"

But there is another type of subject used in debate classes which is not strictly bilateral. It has compromise possibilities. And a fear is expressed that students will not be led to recognize these possibilities. On the contrary, the compromise solution is constantly being brought out in debate. To illustrate, the question may be, "Should the Bursum Pension Bill be passed?" Now the affirmative will, it is true, be required to make a speech favoring the increases advocated in the bill. But the negative does not have to answer with an emphatic "No." If after studying the situation he finds that increases are needed, but not in such large amounts as proposed, he will probably admit the need and urge that a modification of the bill providing for smaller increases should be passed. If it is still objected that in the debate class the affirmative and negative, though making admissions and concessions, are inflexible in their fundamental positions, it may be

observed that students are often quite ready to admit the superiority of their opponents' case; and if time permitted there would be no objection to emphasizing this feature. However, the essential aims of a debate course are, frankly, not to encourage shifting of ground nor to settle problems, but rather to cultivate the students' ability to bring together and express in a complete, well-organized, sound address what may be said in support of a definite attitude toward a question of the day. Anyone who has had experience in ordinary deliberative gatherings will hardly deny that a training which increases the students' ability to do these things is sufficiently valuable to offset the alleged danger of conjuring up a "fight-image."

The elimination of debating strikes the present writer as distinctly Utopian, as well as undesirable. If socialists and capitalists, drys and wets, pro-debaters and anti-debaters did not exist, or if they could come together with tentative, disinterested minds, capable of repressing inclinations to support a given position, then argument might indeed be relegated to the limbo of useless devices. At present, however, it sems likely that discussions of non-argumentative type will have to continue to be confined to undebatable subjects, or else participated in by carefully—very carefully—selected persons. For even reformers in this field are prone to maintain a position in no uncertain terms.

TWO YEARS OF OPEN FORUM DEBATING AT SWARTHMORE*

PHILIP M. HICKS
Swarthmore College

IT is not the purpose of this paper to add to the literature of controversy concerning the relative value of the so called 'old' and 'new' styles of debate. During the past two seasons most of the colleges of the Eastern Group have probably heard contests embodying in some form the features of the newer style, and opinions based upon theory are being replaced by observations based upon practice. Opinions, undoubtedly, still differ sufficiently to form a basis for interesting private discussion, but opinions, whether enthusiastic or prejudiced, have little value as evidence. I am proposing, therefore, to try to suppress a freely confessed bias in favor of the Open Forum Debate, for the moment, to state briefly some conclusions based upon a two year's trial of it.

During the past two seasons Swarthmore's debating teams, including both the men's and the women's, have participated in twenty-four Open Forum debates involving fourteen different institutions. This year no old style debates were held. What has been the effect of these two seasons, upon the debaters, upon the quality of the speaking and upon the debate audience?

In one respect only must opinion obtrude, and that at the outset. Before proceeding to conclusions as to results obtained it is necessary to state the objects sought, which involves an adventure into the realms of pure opinion upon that extremely hazardous topic, the aims of debate. As a matter of necessary exposition it should be stated that the objective sought in debating at Swarthmore, toward which progress is to be measured, is the development of public discussion of current questions by undergraduates. By "public discussion" we mean an approximation

*Read at the joint meeting of the Eastern and New England Conferences at Harvard University, April 11, 1924.

of the conditons that normally obtain between speaker and audience at any meeting calling for an interchange of opinion upon matters of common concern upon which the sentiment of the body is to be expressed in the form of a vote. As "current questions" we include problems of immediate interest whether local, academic, national or international in scope, rather than stock questions of policy such as the tariff, labor organization, Government ownership, or the relative merits of the English and American systems of government—questions which, in general require of the speaker the ability to reason from facts and principles of common knowledge rather than the gathering of an array of facts from statistical abstracts and printed records. That the results of undergraduate reasoning processes may not be profound, does not greatly disturb us, not solely because of the example of Congress, but because we are interested in the exercise, rather than the results, of these powers, and because the open forum feature and the right to question the speaker can be counted upon to correct any undue violence to credulity. Finally, we seek to make this type of discussion a vital thing, not for the speaker alone but for all students who can be brought to expose themselves to it; to give it a place in the complex organization of college life. It will at once be seen that these aims do not include either the fostering of debate as a sport or contest, or as an adjunct to the Public Speaking curriculum for the teaching of Argumentation. Such elements of both as do remain are incidental to the main purpose. This statement of aims is made in the interests of clearness, not controversy.

A word as to the form of the contest used seems justified by the many inquiries received and the occasional misunderstandings as to what constitutes an Open Forum debate. Usually each college has entered but two speakers, one on each side of the question. This split team feature eliminates any disposition on the part of the audience to align itself with the home team and facilitates the selection of speakers according to their natural bias upon the question. The time limit for the speakers has varied from a minimum of fifteen minutes to a maximum of no limit at all, and the practice of allowing the first speaker a short rejoinder is usually settled by mutual agreement. After the close of the programmed speeches the Open Forum is held, subject to the governance of the presiding officer; the main speakers may not re-enter unless questioned. At

the close of the discussion the audience votes upon the merits of the question, by ballot, by show of hands or such form of division as may be preferred. An interesting variation in the voting is obtained by taking two ballots from the audience, one recording their opinion at the start of the debate as favorable, neutral or opposed to the question, the other at the end. Assuming the first ballot to be accurate, a comparison of the two reflects the persuasive power of each team rather more definitely than a simple division on the question, as there may be a considerable change of opinion from negative to affirmative, let us say, which might still be insufficient to overcome an overwhelmingly negative opinion at the start. It will be seen then that there is no fixed form of Open Forum debate. It is susceptible of many modifications. Those outlined above seem best adapted to the aims we have had in view.

What then have been the results? In regard to the debaters themselves, has interest in discussion for its own sake replaced the interest in the competition offered by the old style of debating? I think on the whole that it has. There are five hundred students at Swarthmore; thirty-five tried out for inter-collegiate contests this year, sixteen actually participated in the debates. These numbers represent a slight increase over preceding years; not enough to be startling, enough however to justify a belief that the introduction of the Open Forum debate has not resulted in a loss of interest or lack of competition for places on the team.

The percentage of contestants finally making the teams is somewhat higher than it was under the old form. Some students spoke on more than one question. Does this mean that the preparation has been less thorough? If the actual number of hours spent upon the question or the actual amount of material read is taken as the standard of thoroughness, then the answer is probably yes. But the queston is not quite so simple. The nature of the topic enters in. "Resolved that there should be an immediate revision of the tariff downward" and "Resolved that this house approves the French policy of occupation of the Ruhr valley" make different demands on the speakers in the way of preparation of the question. Furthermore the object of discussion is not that any speaker or team of speakers should be presumed to present the whole case, or as much of it as may safely be presented for partisan purposes. It is rather that out of the conflict and impact of many individual

opinions the audience may glimpse the truth afar off. Understanding preparation then to mean preparation for the sort of speaking contemplated under the aims of the Open Forum debate, it does not suffer. The squad meetings usually resolve themselves into a series of informal debates upon some phase of the question. The coach has complete jurisdiction over the assignment of topics and the order of speaking. Each contestant must be prepared to open the discussion for his side, to take it up at any point or to speak upon any given phase of the question. Everything is done to discourage the written-out and memorized speech and to encourage direct reply to the preceding speaker.

What are the effects of these methods upon the debating? Are students developing under it a more spontaneous, direct and persuasive style of speaking? It is perhaps still too early to answer this question categorically. Students previously accustomed to the American style of debate in college or preparatory school do not completely change their manner in one or two years. A few of the students after two years of experience with the Open Forum method have developed the freedom requisite to the greatest effectiveness in this type of speaking. In others the effects of the rigidity of the old style and the lack of experience in platform repartee are still too apparent. Certainly the debates are more interesting, that is the common expression from audience and speakers alike, but to that interest the novelty of the form and the nature of the question contribute as well as the style of the speakers. I would not at present claim more on this score than a conviction that Open Forum debating, practiced throughout the college course, will develop a more persuasive and effective speaking style than formal debating has done.

That Open Forum debates are interesting has been the general comment of those who have attended them, but the number attending them has not increased or decreased perceptibly. There has been no revival spirit attendant upon the introduction of Open Forum debate, nor is there likely to be. It must make its way slowly if at all. The most hopeful development along the line of awakening interest during the past year has been the close cooperation of the Debate Board, the forensic governing body, with the Polity Club, the student organization devoted to the discussion of public affairs. The activity of some such organization seems to

be almost indispensable to the development of debating as an undergraduate interest. Debating ought to be the result of a keen and vital interest in the discussion of public affairs, instead we are having to use it as a means of stimulating that interest, reinforcing it with college credits, with Delta Sigma Rho keys, student honors and such materialistic sources of appeal.

Open Forum debating has suffered in some quarters from the opinion that it is a mere imitation of the English method, of necessity futile because of the obvious impossibility of reproducing the atmosphere and traditions of Oxford in American colleges. This is an unfortunate misconception. Surely we may acknowledge freely our debt to the visiting Oxonians for the example they have given us of clear, witty and persuasive speech without seeking to copy either their institutions or their motives. Open Forum debating existed in America prior to the English invasion. Its essential features have been employed at Swarthmore in local contests for at least five years. Because English students have a naturally keen interest in their governmental policies; because public affairs have a place in their daily conversation, must we infer that to be American we must abstain from them? If American college students have no vital interest in matters of public concern, is it an occasion for self congratulation or for corrective activity? Because no American college gets such a concentration of parliamentary timber as the two great English universities, must we plan our curriculum and our student activities to suit the needs and tastes of embryo Babbits? The quickening of general undergraduate interest in the discussion of public affairs is a huge task. Back of the college is the home and in the homes are the millions of indifferent voters whose apathy and inertia make possible the recurrent scandals of our political life. But is it not a part of the function of colleges to supply opportunities and incentives that may be lacking in home life? The difficulty of the task is lightened only by the supreme necessity of accomplishing it.

But we are straying into the realms of opinion again. Let us return to cases, and to that admirable feature of the old style debate, the concluding summary.

Although probably nothing has been "proved conclusively," the two years trial of the Open Forum plan in intercollegiate debating has confirmed our favorable opinion of it, and has indicated

progress toward the accomplishment of the aims we have had in view. It has held the interest and enthusiasm of the debators; it has resulted in more interesting debates and has shown signs of becoming an effective agency in developing a more direct and persuasive style of speech. While it has not noticeably increased the size of debate audiences, except in the case of the Oxford debates, it has interested audiences to a degree that gives grounds for hope that the ultimate result may be a more general attendance and a wider undergraduate interest in public discussion of current affairs.

ON THE OPEN FORUM

C. L. MENSER
Knox College

THE open forum system of debating is here to stay. It may never displace completely the decision system, but it is certainly not the mere fad which its opponents hoped so fervently it might be. Nevertheless there are certain defects, I believe, not in the system but in the present conduct of the system, which should be corrected. These defects are here noted by one who is not a debate "coach" with an axe to grind, but by one who has observed and prayed for its success. And as faith without works is dead, or something like that, I herewith contribute my mite. Some will think I have merely dropped a button in the collection plate, but no matter.

One has only to observe the average audience at the average open forum debate to note certain significant facts. The average listener too often does not know what it is all about. The speakers in their constructive speeches do not carry the audience with them in building up their cases. The audience sighs wearily as it wishes for the end of the time for the formal debate. The questions then asked are too often those of other debate students with pet hobbies on the question or of faculty or others who have either made a special study of the case or "loaded up" especially for the occasion. All of which is only to say that too often—not always—the give and take of the debators has not stirred the audience to ask questions, as it should. And the answers! Occasionally there is a clean-cut answer that clearly nails the very pelt of the question to a board to dry. Whereat the audience grins its approval and settles back for more. But too often the answer is an evasion; sometimes a statement which misses the crux of the question asked—in which case the questioner chooses to say he is answered rather than appear inhospitable to the visitors or show up his own team's ignorance. Sometimes there is even a mis-statement of fact, given with the knowledge that the questioner has no comeback.

Such, I take it, is not the sort of discussion the open forum should bring to us. Nor would it, under better conditions. These conditions may be based upon one lone idea, which is that the approach to a question is and must be essentially different under the open forum system and under the decision system. The nature of the audience and the nature of the part the audience is to play in either case shows this. On the one hand, there is an audience of laymen, supposedly, who are not specialists in debating, who know nothing of the text-book technique of argumentation and probably very little of the question under discussion. Their decision is an expression of their opinion upon the proposal put forward by the affirmative and opposed by the negative. Only indirectly do they testify to the ability of the debaters as debaters. On the other hand, under the decision system, there is an audience of one or three specialists (let us hope) who are looking for technical blows and knockouts, who think of issues and percentages, who consciously dissect arguments, and who render a decision not on the truth in the discussion but on the technical skill with which the teams brought out certain parts of the truth. The instructions to the judges emphasize "on the merits of the debate." And the real audience is this audience of one or three, no matter how many other people may be among those present.

The open forum debate must be planned for and presented to an audience of laymen, if it is to be successful. To this end the debaters should observe several precautions. They should, so far as possible, avoid technical language; where such language must be used, they should translate it into terms which the average man can understand. This rule applies to the terminology of debating which is often used in addressing the other team or (under the decision system) the judges. But it applies more particularly to those carefully boiled-down phrases by which the debater is able to say three minutes' worth in three words, but in which the listener often sees nothing but the three words. Such phrases are heard again and again in debate, sometimes urged as the one thing upon which the whole argument hinges, while the audience sits painfully ignorant of their meaning. In a debate upon the World Court both teams cried aloud about "justiciable disputes," while the audience was left in the dark as to just when a dispute was justiciable and when not. Specific instances brought

up by one team were disputed by the other. Definitions were given with bias and questioned with prejudice. Nowhere was there a place for setting forth not the affirmative idea nor the negative idea but the real truth about the nature of justiciable disputes. With argument directed to a judge such an omission may not be so dangerous; in the open forum system it is fatal. It is the debater's business to teach his audience, to take it with him, to be absolutely clear as to what is going on; and in so far as he does not do this, through failure to explain technical terms and phrases, he fails as a debater.

Moreover, and in line with what has just been said, the open forum debate must not deal solely with statements of general principle. There is a crying need of specific instances under the general. The average man cannot think abstractly. He needs something definite—a peg to hang his thought on. And if he does not get it, his interest wanes. Too many times the debater carries over from the decision system a fear of giving specific instances which may be attacked by an opponent. True it is that a carefully worded general statement is less liable to successful attack than an inference from a specific instance. But the debater who prides himself on his ability to state a point so that an opponent cannot find a place to "get his hooks into it" must remember that he may be stating it so smoothly that his hearers don't even understand what he is talking about. Nor will restatement, which never proved anything, clinch the proof and establish the point, as the debater often seems to assume. Most needed is an appreciation of the value of specific facts in clearing up for the layman the exact force of given general principles in the case.

A word needs to be said upon strategy. For I believe it is not properly used in the open forum debate. Here again the difficulty is probably due to its being brought over intact from the decision system. To the layman, the view of two debaters employing strategy is too often that of two young cocks facing each other, legs stiff, heads down, neck feathers ruffled, each waiting for the other to do the wrong thing so that he can be pounced upon. Now hoping for awkwardness on the part of an opponent is not real strategy. Time and again in debate the audience hears the rather startling announcement that the speaker has just caught his opponent on the hip and thrown him with a thud. If the speaker is on

his home floor the audience says to himself (in some schools this may be taken literally), "Did you? That's fine." If he is of the visiting team, the audience says, "You're crazy, I didn't hear it." Never, or certainly very seldom, is the strategy so well planned and clearly executed that the audience bursts into spontaneous applause at its culmination. Yet the strategy of the Lincoln-Douglass debates was of that sort. And it was so excellent and real that it stands out from the printed page, bereft of the personality and power of the speakers, with telling force. The open forum debaters must quit their eternal sparring, they must eliminate willful or unconscious distortions of truth as bases for showing up opponents, and they must learn that the only strategy worth while is that which takes the audience along with it.

The success of the open forum system depends not upon the debaters' ideas of effectiveness in their arguments and answers, but upon what they bring to pass in the minds of the audience. If the system is to live and grow it must construct its debates for the whole audience. When it has done so, debating will be really vital. It will stand on high ground. It will concern itself not with the development of trained mental jugglers but with the dissemination of truth through public discussion.

LOGIC AND ARGUMENTATION

GLADYS MURPHY GRAHAM
University of California

THE temptation was to write the title "The Logic *of* Argumentation" but that would involve the assumption of what is not yet a fact. Better to state the situation as it stands: Logic on the one hand as an abstract phase of Philosophy, and over against it, separated from it, Argumentation. Indeed it is that separation which is the *raison d'etre* of this discussion. It is the belief of the writer that Logic, the new and the old, taken over and adapted, holds much of value for Argumentation. There happens to be also the converse belief that the careful study of Argument as the field in which Logic is actually at work, as the subject matter of an applied Logic, could do much for that abstract science through added concreteness and vivid illustration—but that is the logician's problem and outside the scope of this discussion. The one facing us is as to what Logic has to give to Argumentation, what the intermingling of the two now separated fields could mean to that study.

But a question immediately arises: Are the fields at present actually separated? In our Public Speaking texts we have from a few pages to a few chapters dealing with Logic. Is it not true that the barrier has thus been broken down, that Logic is now giving, or at least having an opportunity to give, all it can to Public Speaking? I do not believe that this is the case for two reasons: First, only traditional Logic—fragmentary at that—has found its way into our Public Speaking texts. What we are taking over of it is but the part that stood before recent years when the "new Logics" entered the field, not, as we shall note, to supplant or discredit the old but to supplement and definitely add to it. Thus we have, for example, the work of H. W. B. Joseph modifying and bringing much closer to an extra-scientific field the inductive work of Mill; we have Dewey giving invaluable suggestions here and there; Keynes with his Logic of Probability; Alfred

Sidgwick seeking definitely for applications and making valuable advances while remaining within the linear type of reasoning; and, outstandingly perhaps, Bosanquet, giving—though he buried it rather deeply in philosophical terminology and discussion—a vital alternate method for our work. All this is Logic—but as yet practically untouched as far as the field of Argumentation is concerned. Thus Logic is now far removed from Argumentation, because only a small part of it, the traditional part, has ever been brought into any sort of relationship to it.

But there is a second reason and an even more serious one. Into what type of relationship have we brought even the part of the subject? It seems to the writer that what we have secured is only juxtaposition, not assimilation or adaptation. We have taken certain portions of traditional Logic straight out of Philosophy's field where Philosophy has used it for its own purposes, illustrating it, when at all, from the physical sciences, and we have put it next to traditional Public Speaking. The actual application of Logic to Public Speaking cannot be said to have failed—for it has never been tried.

Since, then, there is a distinct separation of Logic and Argumentation, the discussion may proceed in relation to its main theme and purpose—that of attempting to show very briefly that Logic, brought over into our field and adapted to it, has much to give. But the task is approached with a full realization of the fact that there exists today considerable general criticism of Logic as a practical science, a tendency to discredit it. What, then, of this general criticism?

When viewed closely, it is found to be almost wholly of the categorical syllogism or subsumption and, in regard to it, that it is too formal, its confines too narrow to hold *all* our actual thought without grotesquely distorting it, painfully compressing it into a preconceived mold. Such is the actual extent and nature of practically all the criticism when reduced to concrete terms. It is a serious charge and we shall take it carefully into account in our work, but it is basic thus initially to note its nature and limited extent, for we who have stood outside the philosophical arena and caught only bits of the news of the battle that is being waged have been a little inclined to do two things: First, we have taken the pivot point of the controversy, the syllogism, to be synonymous

with all Logic;[1] then, we have enlarged the argument, "This form does not fit and apply to *all* reasoning" to "It does not apply to *any* reasoning." A strange point of view, this last, for those of us in Argumentation when our whole debate brief is based upon the syllogism—but more of that in a moment. First, what of the large field of Logic outside that of the challenged syllogism or subsumptive reasoning? Here is the vast and rich area largely untouched by criticism. For it we may legitimately note applications and specific values leaving till later the question of values within the contested field.

And in non-subsumptive Logic there is much to interest the Public Speaking group. There is, for example, that division which deals with the whole question of the basis on which we may validly generalize—because a thing is true in certain cases, will it always hold true? How many instances of success of a plan prove *necessity* and so future success? There is that vital division which considers when one thing can be validly held to be the cause of another—how prove that armament indeed will cause war, that the direct primary will cause better, or worse, men in office. And finally, there is that part which is concerned with the whole matter of implication—if this thing is true, what will follow; given this part of a total situation, what must the remaining part, the thing necessary to complete it, be? Is the League of Nations actually implied in, made necessary by, the world situation? Here the "new Logic" has vast possibilities.

It is, of course, utterly impossible to give within the scope of this discussion with any sort of detailed completeness the applications of non-syllogistic Logic to debate; we can only suggest a few instances of the possibilities selected almost at random. Take, for example, the matter of the question put to an opponent, which is at present enjoying such a vogue. It is asked, when justifiable, to bring out an admission from which certain damaging conclusions

[1]Such seems to be the explanation of the stand taken by a recent author as he writes: "The logical presentation is almost sure to miss its aim. Now that historical and developmental approach has been discovered to be so fundamentally significant. . . ." The fact is that the Bosanquetian Logic of System is based on exactly "the historical and developmental approach" and very definitely it is "logical." The narrowly *syllogistic* presentation really would not apply in the given case but *syllogism* and Logic are not synonymous.

can be drawn, that is, in which are *implied* certain things. "If this is true, and you have admitted in your answer to our question that it is, then this and this and this must, inevitably, by the very rules governing valid thought, follow." Perhaps it is a "thin edge of the wedge" argument[2]—"if you admit this, the initial step, where can you consistently stop? How can you refuse to go on to a whole chain of implied consequences?" We are attempting to do this thing in debate after debate but—just when *does* one thing imply another? How can we, save on the basis of Logic, tell if truly and show why one thing implies another—for the matter of implication is definitely a logical one and, at its best, a phase of the "new Logic[3]." The question in the hands of the man who knows what admissions will imply the ones desired, who is conscious of the rules governing his method, is a formidable weapon. By means of it he can construct of opposing admissions valid proof-structure for the support of his own case.

And further in relation to implication: probably there is no more frequently met assumption than that the refusal of one plan, the inability or failure to present a better method of securing a given end implies that the proposed plan should be adopted. Is this actually the case? If a Negative has shown that an Affirmative plan is, to quote Bruce Bairnsfather's "Ole Bill", "a 'ell of a 'ole", does it still devolve upon it to find a "better 'ole", before it has disproved the Affirmative case? Can the Affirmative contend that in the lack of a better plan is *implied* the necessary acceptance of its own? It does so constantly and the rebuttal speaker falls back on the authority of our traditional debate assumption that the Negative has only the burden of *dis*proof by which the Affirmative implication is denied. Yet the growing tendency of the Negative to present an alternate case shows the questioning, though usually hazily, of that traditional assumption. If the Negative, as assumed, need only disprove, why the alternate case? The fact to be noted is that, along with the possibilities and effective use of a question

[2]Sidgwick, Alfred, *The Application of Logic*, pp. 40-45.

[3]The matter of the question is bound up in that of a hypothetical reasoning as treated in elementary Logic texts and, even more essentially, with that of "Logic of System" implications as considered in a little book to be discussed later, Bosanquet's *Implication and Linear Inference*. The basis of scientific rebuttal of such argument is also to be found in the same sources.

put to an opponent, the matter of the alternate case, the necessity for its being, the type of reasoning which gives an opening for it, is bound up in and mainly based upon the question of valid implication and its corollary in the Bosanquetian system—disjunction. Of course the question and the alternate case can be used without a knowledge of their bases and laws, as chemicals can without a knowledge of chemistry. But in both cases it is a rather risky, hit-or-miss process. Argumentation needs Logic as a scientific basis, as a means of testing its own assumption, of, perhaps it may be said, explaining itself to itself.

Consider the matter of analogy. There is scarcely a debate in which it does not figure as a part of the proof. Yet without Logic little can be known of the actual means of valid construction. To establish an analogy we tend merely to note and catalogue similarities and hold that, since these exist, what is true of the one case will be true of the other shown to resemble it in enumerated respects. An opponent in rebuttal cites differences and on the basis of them triumphantly asserts that, "There is no analogy!" Of course this is not quite all, for the similarities and differences are usually by each side stated to be "essential." The word is an easy and convenient one and in it is the vital point in regard to the proof value of an analogy. But can any one tell what an *essential* similarity or difference is unless he tell it in terms of cause and effect? The only similarity that is essential in the matter of indicating that what has happened in one case will happen in another—the usual type of debate analogy—is the similarity that has *caused* the occurrence in the first case. Cause must be repeated to secure repetition of effect. All the accompanying conditions, though numerous and spectacular, if non-causal are non-essential. Between cases alike in many or all of them there is no analogy. Repetition of cause is essential to the argument. But the matter of determining cause is a purely and rather intricately logical one.

And here, at the question of the determination of cause, we are facing one of the problems in relation to which we may see most outstandingly the need of governing principle. Scarcely a case is debated or informally argued in which cause and effect do not play a large part. Shall a new law be passed or accepted? The question is what will be its results, what will it *cause?* Shall we accept commission government in X city, or referendum in Y

state? A double computation of cause is involved: Will it remove the present evils by eliminating their cause, and will it, in its turn, cause new evils or the advantages cited for it?[4] Shall the terms of the Treaty of Versailles hold? The question is not merely one of what France suffered, or even of abstract justice. Nor can it be settled by the rendition of a war poem. The computation must be, as in all Judgments of Practice, of *something to be done.*[5] So we might go on. Argument is constantly causal. And how is it customary to meet the problem of determining cause? Generally in one of two ways: by mere assertion or by enumeration of affirmative or negative instances backed up by a vague faith in the Uniformity of Nature, that what has been in a few cases will be in the new case under consideration. Commission government has succeeded in W, X, and Y cities, therefore it will succeed in Z city where it has not yet been tried—and the opponent holds that it has failed in M and O and therefore will fail in Z. Thus each group holds the fort above its little pile of unevaluated evidence—and the unfortunate judges or audience are left to decide the question!

A recent writer tells us, in relation to the reasoning that because a thing has been in certain enumerated cases it will continue to be in those to follow, that "the man who has fed the chicken every day throughout its life at last wrings its neck instead—showing that the more refined views as to the Uniformity of Nature would have been useful to the chicken[6]!" So would they be to the debater. Logic shows the reason why one can never prove for a future case on the basis of enumeration of what has happened in the past, a simple principle the realization of which would tend to have a revolutionary effect upon Argument. It shows that such reasoning has at best only *probability*[7] proof value, it deals with its

[4]Here we have the possibility of what may be termed the "Out of the frying-pan into the fire" argument. Granted what is opposed is bad—the new solution will bring much worse results. The argument is most effective, and basically causal.

[5]Cf. Dewey, John, "The Judgment of Practice" in *Essays in Experimental Logic.* There is nothing more vital to the realization of the proof requirements of a debate proposition than a knowledge of its peculiar nature as a judgment of something to be done. This Argumentation has tended to overlook.

[6]Russell, Bertrand, *The Problem of Philosophy*, p. 298.

[7]Keynes has done much for the Logic of Probability in his *A Treastise on Probability.*

legitimate function and limitations.

But Logic not only shows the unsoundness of meeting the matter of prediction of results by haphazardly piling up past instances; it gives the means of valid prediction through computation of cause, the duplication of which will duplicate results. It is far from an easy matter to eliminate—and elimination is the basic principle—from the mass of *conditions* that surround the thing being considered those that are merely happenstance, and to scientifically show cause. The general tendency in thought is to hit upon any thing that precedes or accompanies and hold it to be causal. We see armament preceding war and easily take it to be the manipulatable cause of it, the one the removal of which would remove the result. But other things precede war, trade rivalries, the festering effects of past instances of the Carthaginian type of peace, the lack of coincidence of political, ethnic and economic boundaries. . . . Any one of these might as reasonably be held to be cause. Perhaps armament itself may by a scientific investigation be found to be in fact an effect, something not basically causal, its removal incapable of removing war. An evil is noted in our judicial system—some law is proposed to change this or that and the presence of the evil is ardently argued in support of the proposition that the law should be passed. The vital point requiring proof, that the change proposed *eliminates the cause* of the evil and does not merely affect a condition and, in fact, a condition itself causal in another and beneficial direction, is often not touched upon at all.

Just what can Logic do for this very practical problem of cause? It can articulate it, can show what is required—the elimination of the irrelevant — give something of the tests of causal relevance, and, very definitely, the vital methods of elimination. What we now have regarding the determinaton of cause in the superimposed Logic of our Public Speaking texts is from the work of John Stuart Mill, a remarkable study for its time, it need hardly be said, but one buried rather deeply in technical phraseology and directly applicable only to the physical, indeed the experimental, sciences. In his recent work,[8] Mr. Joseph has rather wonderfully tempered the work of Mill, made it more available for the social, non-experimental sciences, shown the unity of the "Methods"

[8]Joseph, H. W. B., *An Introduction to Logic.*

of Agreement, Difference, etc., stressed the factor so outstandingly vital for Argumentation both in constructive and rebuttal work—the chipping away of the non-causal. It is true that in this work too the study is for a field other than our own and in terms of that field. Here, as for all the works cited and noted, Argumentation must assimilate and adapt, but if translated and applied, the study of Mr. Joseph's along with certain other works in the newer Logic will open a new heaven and a new earth to Argumentation, changing its method from necessary trial and error and catch-as-catch-can to accurate scientific calculation.

We can only touch here upon one other phase of logical application but that one cannot be overlooked. What of the matter of present day briefing and that vital and related question of determining main issues? It seems to be a fact that the eve of brief-drawing is for most debaters the zero hour. Indeed, it is at present natural that such should be the case. The debater is faced by a mass of usually haphazardly collected data—we have little or nothing to say in argumentative work of the function of the hypothesis in guiding the collection of material—with generalizations, facts, organized bits of prearranged material of one kind or another, and the question of what to do with them. It is their *relational* proof value that is vital at the briefing stage. How construct from this mass an organic whole, an argument exactly sufficient to prove a given proposition of a specific type?

At present we answer the question with our statements of matter to be excluded and "Rules for Briefing." These instructions and definite rules are of undoubted value and have probably gone as far as mechanics of briefing can go, and yet—are there not very definite and inherent limitations involved in reducing a thought process to mechanics? Consider the initial injunction to exclude from the collected mass irrelevant matter: Well and good—but just what constitutes relevance? How is the average student, given nothing but a vague definition of the term, to pick out those arguments which are actually irrelevant to a specific discussion? The tests of relevance are logical. Buried deep in an abstract science they lie—and we are content to tell the student to apply them when they have not been given him to apply.

But excluding the irrelevant is only the beginning; then the student must "Find the *main issues.*" And how? Apparently by

subtraction. Whatever mass of material the student has been able, or ambitious enough, to collect minus irrelevant, admitted, and extraneous matter equals main issues and subsidiary points! Main issues, then, as a residue of a varying group of facts and a constant type of substraction—? But they are the points which must be established to prove a means-end proposition, the sum total of its proof requirements. In the matter of their determination is involved the whole vital question of exact sufficiency of proof. It is self-evident that there is a definite possibility of collecting a large mass of material on a given subject within which will not be found those actual proof requirements. Then how know when this is the case? And again, how recognize main issues if present? Such questions can only be scientifically answered in terms of the necessities of the means-end proposition and the logical requirements of the form of proof it takes. If potential or hypothetical main issues meet the requirements, they establish their claim to the title; if the requirements are not met by any part of the evidence on hand, the student should know it, for the need is then for more evidence.

It is also true that all material relevant to a proposition and not admitted is not rightly a part of its proof. Some current arguments—probably the worst and certainly the most boring—do seek to use everything that can possibly be collected regardless of need, reminding one of the nine and twenty excellent reasons which the Mayor of Coventry gave for refusing to ring the bells in honor of Queen Elizabeth after he had stated, "In *primis,* we have no bells" by way of preface! Such loose argument that indiscriminately includes everything relevant cannot be effective, pointed, vitalized proof. It would do much for debating to write large in every argumentative study the sentence which reads: "Completeness does not mean exhaustiveness *per se* but adequacy as respects means and its end[9]." The difficulty is that such a statement could not be followed merely by the present instructions for securing main issues by subtraction plus the rules for mechanically listing the data still on hand when main issues, too, are taken out, under

[9]Dewey, *op. cit.*, p. 343. Bosanquet writes in the same vein on this subject though, it need hardly be mentioned, the two are in general poles apart philosophically: "The whole is not merely all we have but satisfies our intelligence by definite necessity." *Implication and Linear Inference.* p. 19.

one or another of them as its proof. In such there is no actual test of adequacy.

It is worthy of note, too, that the most basic of the rules for briefing rests for the validity of its results upon the correct application of a logical principle not given. "The relation between sub-headings or series of sub-headings is never expressed by 'hence' or 'therefore', but by 'for' or 'because.'[10]" And why? Because "for" or "because" denote the movement of logical proof from conclusion back to premises. When a valid proof relationship exists it is because this logical "for" of the thought movement turning back for proof has been correctly used. A very frequent source of error arises from the fact that there is also the "for" of the reason why a thing *might* be so, as in the following:

C. The industrial court has been tried and has succeeded (for)
1 ----------
2. It is in line with the evolutionary progress of society.[11]

Certainly 2 is not proof of the truth of C, yet it "reads"[12] smoothly when the parts are connected by the given link, the "for", and that is the only criterion the student has. He has not been told why or how he is to use it—only *to* use it, and it is capable of ambiguity. One need run over but a few briefs to realize that only as the "for" is used in its logical sense is the work valid. Then would it not be well to give the actual proof requirements which govern the combining of pieces of evidence in the construction of proof instead of a hook by which the loose parts of the argument are said to be capable of being mechanically joined?

The bold facts in regard to the thought basis of the brief are, it is believed, as follows: the proposition to be established stands as the conclusion of a syllogism itself, as already mentioned, a particular type of proposition with special proof requirements; the combined main issues form the minor premise, their sufficiency and right to the place as such made evident by the enlargement of the enthymeme formed by them in combination with the conclusion;

[10] Baker and Huntington, *Principles of Argumentation*, p. 256.
[11] *University Debaters' Annual*. 1920-1921, p. 144.
[12] Cf. Baker and Huntington, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43.

the validity of the whole is testable according to the requirements of syllogistic proof.

But here we are out of the non-contested field, back to the categorical syllogism, to the phase of Logic constantly criticized, and we are now ready to consider the previously noted criticism of it—that it is too formal, too restrictive to be the dominating form for all reasoning. That criticism we wish to grant at least for applied Logic but to note immediately that the vital point for Argumentation in relation to it is the fact that the standard debate brief, based, as we have seen, upon the syllogism, must face the same criticism. The debate brief forces linear, syllogistic reasoning; its "for" or "because" are, as noted, the "for" or "because" of proof referring from conclusions back to grounds of evidence. When the brief gives valid argumentative structure it is because as a whole and in relation to its parts it has fulfilled the requirements of valid syllogistic reasoning. Now let us remember again, that the criticism of the syllogism is not of it as *a* form of reasoning but as *the exclusive* form. We make the same criticism of the standard brief. The fact is, the science of thought has realized the limitations of linear inference, the syllogistic type of reasoning which was its basic and all-inclusive form, and the "new Logics," offer new forms that thought may take. It is interesting to note that while this has been going on a group in Argumentation, repudiating Logic on the very basis of the formal inapplicability of its syllogistic reasoning, has clung to a brief that is set and formal and restrictive, a brief that is syllogistic. An anomalous situation, is it not?

Let it be clearly understood, we are not saying that debate can dispense with the syllogism. Its value and absolute necessity in many cases are generally granted. Bosanquet, while a noted critic of syllogistic Logic, shows that, "Every direct answer to the demand for an adequate cause or reason implies a possible syllogistic form and is false if it cannot meet the tests imposed by that form."[13] Into this class falls much of our debate work; for

[13] Bosanquet, *op cit.*, p. 139. E. W. Johnson, in his excellent *Logic* writes on the same subject: "Having restricted my technical treatment of the syllogism to a single chapter, it will be easily inferred that I attach considerable importance to this form of inference, while at the same time I hold it to be only one among many other equally important forms of demonstrative deduction." (Part II, p. 102). For a summary of the extent of Bradley's indictment cf. his *Principles of Logic*, revised edition, Vol. 1, Book II, Part I, p. 247.

it the standard brief type of thing, conscious of the scientific laws of its syllogistic basis, is vital. For some types of Argument, then, —probably in the set debate for all save the opening and the alternate case speeches—it will always be the exactly fitting thing and the initial need is for an understanding of its scientific basis. But in addition to this it is vital to realize that the standard brief based on the categorical syllogism does not fit all types of Argument. There is need for an alternate type of reasoning and method of arrangement.

It is Bosanquet who has given to the philosophical world that alternate method, *implication* as distinguished from *linear inference*. He has not given it in a form in which it can be put into the hands of the debater, nor in a form in which it will be easily acquired by the Public Speaking teacher. It is a work written by a philosopher for the sake of his philosophical system, yet in the little book *Implication and Linear Inference* is new life for Argumentation. The work gets away from the proof by points as such, from partial treatment and arguing at a question, to the realization and depicting of a complex situation and the reading out of it of its necessary completing factor. One is arguing for the League of Nations: in place of the controversial, "I will prove that the League should be adopted for

A. It is practical, for
   1 ----------
   2 ------
B. It will not limit the sovereignty of nations, for
   1 ----------
C. It will tend to secure peace, for
   1 ------
   2 ----------"

is put a portrayal of the world situation as a whole. In essence, it is not definitely controversial at all, but in a very real sense it is argumentative. The audience accepts the situation as its portrayal progresses, through its development they are carried along until it begins to be evident that into such a complex but one thing fits, that that thing is a necessary completing factor. If the work is well done, the acceptance of that completing factor, of the

League of Nations, for example, is seen to be the only possible thing in the light of the situation which is—it is *this,* the proposed solution, or *nothing,* the denial of the previously accepted nature of the complex.

The method of the "This or Nothing" argument of Bosanquet's *Logic of System* cannot be dealt with in detail here. There are laws that govern the construction of the genuine whole out of which the conclusion is read, laws for the shaping and pruning of facts; there are pitfalls to be considered, sources of probable error, tests; for an intensely interesting and vital type of rebuttal there is a reading back from the given part to the necessities of the implied whole—"If you hold this to be true, then all this that fits in with it must accompany it, is implied." It is a remarkable study with outstanding practical value. Bosanquet called it "the natural process in argument;" certainly it is the natural method of opening a case. It is the type of thing one finds certain lawyers doing in the opening of their argument, it is the type of thing of which Woodrow Wilson was past master. There could hardly be finer or more absolute illustrations of the use of the method than his two famous speeches, the first to Congress asking for the declaration of war on Germany, and the other to the Senate, July 10, 1919, presenting the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. No hammer-and-tongs linear inference argument could have had the power of this alternate method. In compressing the reasoning there given into standard brief form we distort it, lose the distinctiveness of its type that peculiarly fitted it for the time and place. But in the past we have known no other form in which to put argument, so into the mold it has all gone—while some of us were discrediting Logic on the basis of too wide use of the rigid syllogism! The inherent difference between that first presentation of the League of Nations by President Wilson and the subsequent speeches on his western tour, those at San Francisco and Pueblo, for example, given in the thick of the battle, direct answers to direct challenges, hammer-and-tongs point-by-point argument selected because a new type of situation demanded it—the fact of difference at least must be very apparent. They are not the same type of argument. The latter are straight syllogistic brief debate style, the other is an alternate method, non-contentious, less antagonistic and so par-

ticularly adapted to a hostile audience, more persuasive,[14] more finished perhaps, for certain types of occasion eminently more fitting. For this sort of argument we will find it necessary to have a new type of brief—but before that can come the form of the reasoning involved must be mined, so to speak, from the depths of its philosophical sources, understood, applied. It is a task worthy the thought and critical attention of the profession.

[14] It is interesting to note that traditional Public Speaking, through its stress on the "History of the Question," has always recognized the persuasive value of the non-contentious approach but, strangely enough, it has dissociated it from the argument proper. The idea seems to have been that first one wins the confidence of the audience and introduces it to the subject under discussion by a totally unbiased History of the Question without argumentative value. Having done this, one swiftly drops persuasion and takes up point-by-point argument. The fact is there is no such line of demarcation. The traditional History of the Question is, if correctly done, a relevant and necessary part of the system to be built up; it is, at its best, *non-contentious* as that system in its initial stages definitely is, but that is a very different thing from being *non-argumentative*. The very basis of the systematic argument is the shaping of all surrounding facts to form the whole of which the conclusion is an integral part. The History of the Question is never rightly a detachable "preliminary" to argument; it is a very vital part of the argument.

PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENTS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS*

GEORGE K. PRATT, M. D.
Medical Director, Massachusetts Society for Mental Hygiene

COLLEGIATE teachers of speech education, like other Faculty members, deal daily with odd, warped or distorted personalities among students. It is a kindly criticism of mental hygienists, however, that while teachers deal daily with such students, all too few of them appreciate the basic reasons for the oddity, or, indeed, sometimes even recognize the distortion for what it really is.

Even a brief acquaintance with the new psychology teaches that adolescence is a period fraught with special menaces to mental health. Steering between the fabled Scylla and Charybdis was no more difficult than the feat required of parents and teachers of boys and girls from 12 to 20 years of age, if the latter are to be guided safely into the relatively smoother waters of maturity. Of course, from a mental hygiene point of view the sensible thing is to early commence a grooming process whereby children of preschool age will be taught instinctively to handle properly new situations and puzzling experiences. Then as adolescence, with its transition from dependent childhood to sturdy emancipation comes on, the boy or girl will already have been prepared to meet new issues in a healthy way and will consequently find the rigours of adjustment less arduous.

Unfortunately such common-sense preparation as this at present is the exception rather than the rule and until the time arrives when mental hygiene shall become as familiar a household word as its twin, physical hygiene, other measures must be utilized. Thus we find it necessary in marking time to fall back on the method of pointing out danger signals. Parents and teachers can, if they will, quickly learn to recognize some of the commoner red lights that point to dangers ahead on the road to mental health, and to teach avoidance of mental pitfalls. For the most part these are expressed in terms of special personalities. The difficulty

* Abstract of an address delivered at the joint meeting of the Eastern and New England Conferences, at Harvard University, April 12, 1924.

of their early recognition, of course, lies in the fact that parents usually, and teachers sometimes, are so close to the scene of action that perception and evaluation of warning symptoms are dimmed.

Among the more spectacular of these special personalities which often serve as precursors to later nervous or mental disability is the belligerent, chip-on-the-shoulder type. Arrogant, contentious, a loud talker and a flashy dresser, this boy or girl may be found on any campus.

Not infrequently a personality study of such a student will reveal these traits as masking a deep feeling of inferiority, and we discover that their possessor may be indulging in that rather common psychologic pastime of over-compensating. Menaced by a spectre of inferiority some people find the suspicion that they may not be as good as the next one so utterly intolerable of entertainment as to require a morale-raising compensation. Thus in fear that others may suspect their secret they tend to over-compensate and natural timidity, pacifism and fearfulness are buried deep under an armor of bravado, boasting, and belligerency. For a time such persons "get by" with this red-herring device to put others off the trail. Eventually, though, it proves a boomerang and as companions begin to penetrate their secret the armor loses its efficiency. Comes a time when the pose no longer can be sustained and the stage is then ready for the next act. This consists usually of a transitional emotion of depression and doubt, followed by a semi-permanent phase of discontent and bitterness. When insight and critical analysis of one's own motives are lacking to account for failures in life, the easiest thing to do is to place the blame on someone else. Therefore with memory of the original menace of inferiority already dimmed, with the protective armor pierced in a dozen places and with failure looming blackly, our student like enough decides he hasn't had a square deal, that the world is against him, and the cards stacked. As a result he grows resentful, argumentative, suspicious, bitter and critical. His manner being unpleasant, people avoid him, and in so doing lend color to his paranoid beliefs. From a collegiate point of view, when this stage is reached, we have a real problem on our hands. Intellectual functions, of course, are not impaired, but a serious dent has been made in a personality.

In this manner have been laid the foundations for many a

chronic campus grouch or even, in a few cases, for life-long mental disease. Likewise, and this statement will kindle wrath in some, the process just described has been found to account for no inconsiderable number of social radicals, "pinks," and other collegiate intelligensia of varying hues. The meaning of that Shakespearian chiding, "The fault, dear Brutus, lives not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings," has, with this group, never really sunk in.

The foregoing describes one way of reacting to a feeling of inferiority. Other methods are encountered, including the one of resignation. Here the individual accepts, after a struggle, the belief of his inferiority and remoulds his life plans on a lower level. A philosophy of renunciation gradually brings some surcease from conflict and he is thereafter content after a fashion to play second fiddle. This fellow quickly sinks into the narrow but comfortable rut of obscurity and leaves little impress for good or evil on his Alma Mater. He may become a grind through another compensatory device by which he satisfies his craving for leadership and prominence by excellence in studiousness; or he may become a superlative collector of bird eggs, postage stamps, or Colonial glassware. It matters little what the hobby is. The important thing is that while he, too, is compensating for a spectre of inferiority, his type of compensation at worst is harmless, and at best, useful. A curative method for inferiority in any one consists in pointing out that if the individual thinks he lacks initiative to succeed in one direction, he probably possesses other talents which can be developed to the point of excelling competitors in another.

Other student personalities which merit individualized attention from teachers include the over-conscientious type; always bending backwards in an effort to do the right thing, like as not associated with a fervent religiosity and dedicated to a life of service, this boy or girl is the joy of the academic instructor who loves a meek and docile pupil, and the despair of the mental hygienist who perceives the dangers ahead. Carried to excess, such personality traits with their growing detachment from social life and healthy recreations often denote an unsatisfactory adjustment to reality. Fortunately most such individuals eventually make wholesome use of their special personalities and become mis-

sionaries, Y. M. C. A. secretaries, social service workers, and occupants of similar altruistic positions. A few fall by the wayside and are compelled, as the maladjustment deepens, to solve their mental conflicts through the medium of a "nervous breakdown" or even a psychosis (insanity).

The underlying specific causes for these special personalities will differ in each case. In many cases, however, one will find such symptoms to be the external signs of a fiercely raging inner conflict. One does not necessarily have to be a Freudian to believe in the conflict theory as a *cassus belli* for some cases of nervous breakdown. Thus with the group under discussion a clash between certain ambitions or desires and certain inherent scruples or morals results in the particular personality evidenced. Compensation again is resorted to as a redemptory device and if the conflict to unusually fierce, it is understandable how over-compensation may easily develop. Morbid introspection, for example, over a psychosexual experience—possibly real but more likely fancied—may thus lead to emotions of deep shame and guilt, to be followed by atonement in a determination on a life of bleak asceticism and ministering to the welfare of others. In such cases it is hard to say just where healthy compensation ends and the unwholesome variety begins. Perhaps the best way to judge is from the effect which the compensatory mechanism exerts on the social structure of the community.

Time is too short to describe additional types. Those quoted give some idea of the material existing in every collection of adolescents. The hopeful thing is that the great majority of student populations can be classed as "average" (some of us feel "normal" is too mythical a designation) and seem to muddle through with a minimum of difficulty. Salvaging the rest, however, is well worth while and is being regarded with increasing frequency by faculties as a measure of great practicality. Mental hygienists maintain that training intellects, after all, is only part of a university's functions; that teaching emotional discipline, inculcating healthy mental habits, implanting a knowledge of simple mental mechanisms which motivate conduct, and preparing the student for a wholesome adjustment to postgraduate life, are the real purposes of a college education.

These latter requisites can only be offered when their import-

ance is sufficiently recognized. Already a few colleges are availing themselves of the opportunity to secure the consulting or teaching services of the psychiatrist, or both. Dartmouth has had for two years a psychiatric consultant while Smith College, this fall, is undertaking the experiment of making a course of lectures on simple mental mechanisms, by a psychiatrist, compulsory for all Freshmen. Vassar is understood to have a psychiatric adviser, while the U. S. Military Academy at West Point has had one for several years.

It is unlikely that existing departments of psychology can perform completely this new kind of service. So much of a purely medical nature is almost always found involved in every case that a keen medical insight seems imperative. The teacher's role in salvaging twisted personalities consists first in recognizing the difficulty for what it really is; secondly, in seeing that the individual is promptly placed in the hands of a competent psychiatrist; and thirdly, in intelligently applying the therapeutic advice of the latter to the student. All three of these measures imply at least a basic knowledge of mental mechanisms and behavioristic psychology on the part of the teacher. It is an important function of the Mental Hygiene movement everywhere to attempt to insert into the curricula of normal and teacher training schools practical courses in mental hygiene.

THE TEACHING OF PUBLIC SPEAKING IN SCHOOLS OF THEOLOGY*

EVERETT LEE HUNT
Cornell University

THE training of preachers in the art of public speaking has an ancient and continuous tradition. The first Christian preachers were prophets in the sense that they gave no thought beforehand to what they should say or how they should say it; for "the Holy Ghost taught them in that very hour what they should say." In the course of the second century, however, this spontaneity of utterance was replaced by the prepared sermon, given at regular intervals by a member of an organized clergy. The sermon combined the functions of teaching and of exhortation. It owed much to the public addresses of the pagan sophists. The Greek and Roman rhetoric was made to serve the purpose of theology. St. Augustine's ideal orator was very similar to Cicero's. To produce the Augustinian preacher we need only to replace law and philosophy, in Cicero's educational scheme, with Scripture. The early church fathers were students and teachers of rhetoric. In the medieval universities, the perfection of systematic theology gave to the sermon a peculiar function in the churchly community. The study of homiletics was asserted to be independent of rhetoric, and to be a separate discipline. With the decay of scholasticism, the usefulness of rhetoric for homiletics was again recognized. In America, the first institutional instruction in the art of preaching was given by professors of sacred rhetoric, and in a number of seminaries the chair of sacred rhetoric still persists. Inquiries addressed to the holders of these chairs showed that they pride themselves on being particularly modern, on breaking away from the formalities of rhetoric and logic, and that they regard the title of their chairs as having only an historic significance.

The relationship between rhetoric and homiletics as it is at

* This paper and the one following, from the report of the Committee on Teaching of Public Speaking in Technical and Professional Schools, are published in full as of very general interest. An abstract appeared in June.

present conceived by theologians, is perhaps best stated by E. C. Dargan, a recognized authority on homiletics.

"Preaching is primarily a distinctive institution of Christianity, and secondarily a kind of public speaking. This order of thought determines the relationship of homiletics to general rhetoric. Any wise and earnest study of the best methods of presenting the truths of the gospel to the people in such manner as to win an acceptance from them, must take account of what history, experience and culture bring forward as the tested principles of successful public speaking. Homiletics may therefore be regarded as the application of rhetoric to preaching. But the origin, history, concomitants, materials and aims of preaching are so different from those of other kinds of public speaking as to require distinctive treatment.

"The four leading topics of homiletics are: Material, Arrangement, Style, Delivery; or, in the old Latin terminology: Inventio, Dispositio, Elocutio, Pronunciatio. Under "Material," first place belongs to Scripture, and the selection, interpretation, exposition and enforcement of Bible texts is to be considered."

The rest of homiletics, Dr. Dargan considers to be largely rhetoric. "Elocution, or the training and practice of voice and gesture, is sometimes taught under homiletics, and sometimes made a special discipline."

This statement of theory becomes more interesting and significant in the light of the experience of your committee.

The World's Almanac for 1922 lists 90 theological seminaries in the United States, with a total of 13,395 students. This report of your committee is based upon an examination of letters and catalogues from 34 institutions. While this may seem a small number as a basis for any trustworthy conclusions, the group includes all the seminaries affiliated with the principal universities of the country, and, in the opinion of your committeeman, most of the other seminaries of the highest academic reputation.

Perhaps because of tradition, or perhaps because the preacher is professionally a public speaker upon religion, the seminaries have more nearly arrived at some agreement concerning the training to be given their students, than seems to be the case in the other institutions studied by this committee.

All the seminaries reporting give courses in homiletics, some of them as many as five. In general, two courses are given; one theoretical, one practical. The practical courses consist in the preparation and delivery of sermons, with criticism and discussion.

The theoretical courses have a broad scope. To quote from a fairly typical statement, (Catalogue Drew Theological Seminary) entitled "Theoretical Homiletics," "This course has to do with homiletic form, and deals with the theory of sermon preparation and delivery. It is designed to acquaint the student with the whole method of sermon building from the selection of the text to the delivery of the completed sermon. The laws of text selection and analysis, the development of the sermon, the art of illustration, the qualities of style, the use of the voice, the care of the body, the different types of sermons, the relation of the sermon to the whole church service, and all other matters that are intimately related to effective preaching are given careful attention." In the 34 institutions studied, the total number of practical homiletical courses was 46, theoretical, 36.

The question immediately arises, what is the practical relationship of such homiletical courses to courses in public speaking? It might be asserted that public speaking is a part of such courses, or that such courses form a part of public speaking as a subject. In the correspondence with the schools, a number of presidents wrote, stating that their institutions offered no work in public speaking. An examination of the catalogues they sent, however, revealed well-organized departments of homiletics, usually administered as a division of the departments of practical theology. Many of those who sent in catalogues marked the pages and sections dealing with public speaking. In no case was attention called to the courses in homiletics.

Another indication of the attitude of the schools on the relationship of homiletics to public speaking is in the academic rank of the men teaching the subjects. Homiletics is taught by full professors, and usually by the most distinguished men in the institution. Hugh Black and Harry Emerson Fosdick, of Union, Dean Brown of Yale, Dean Sperry of Harvard, Professors Soares of Chicago, and Hoyt of Auburn, might be cited. Frank Gunsaulus was a lecturer in homiletics. In general it may be safely said that this subject is taught by the men most distinguished for eloquence, or scholarship, or broad human understanding.

Turning to courses in public speaking, recognized as such, we find fifty courses offered under the headings of elocution, voice culture, interpretation, expression, scripture reading. Twenty-two

courses are offered with descriptions that indicate a broader field than delivery. They seem to differ from homiletics chiefly in that they do not deal with biblical or theological content as a part of the course, and they are usually taught by instructors rather than professors. Practically all courses in public speaking, when taught by men who hold positions primarily in the seminary, are taught by men who rank as instructors. A number of seminaries have endowed instructorships in voice culture and sacred elocution. Many men in such positions give it only a part of their time, which seems to be satisfactory to the seminaries concerned. Seminaries affiliated with universities usually employ the professors of public speaking in the colleges of arts and sciences. In many cases, however, the professor's duty is limited to matters of delivery. In some seminaries, students preach before several critics, the professors of homiletics criticising such matters as sermon structure and outline, elements of persuasion, and propriety of style, as well as matters of religious and theological import. The instructor in public speaking criticizes delivery. Much of the criticism of the professor of homiletics is, of course, as much concerned with form as is the criticism of the instructor in public speaking. There seems to be a feeling that some matters of form are too intimately connected with substance to permit of their being handled by men untrained in the subject matter of the speeches. Form as applied to delivery, however, does seem separable. At least it is separated, and usually relegated to men of lower academic rank.

Two courses in phonetics were found; one to enable foreign students to learn English more quickly and correctly, and the other to aid missionaries in mastering heathen tongues. One course in speech defects is also listed. A number of announcements, however, state that instructors will offer such training in this field as the individual student may need for the correction of his own speech.

Seventeen courses were noted in which the subject matter was the use of the Bible, or specific portions of it, for preaching purposes. The same substance, the Bible, is treated in other courses, where the student's knowledge of the field is the primary object. There seems to be a belief that it is somehow a different thing to present material as a matter of information, and to present it with a view to its use in speeches. The same idea would seem to underlie the seven courses in literature for preaching purposes. The writers

considered in these courses were those usually emphasized in departments of English literature. The object seemed to be, not to acquaint the students with the literature, but to teach them how to use it effectively in sermons.

In any report upon instruction in public speaking in theological seminaries, mention should be made of the literature of the subject. The works in this field extend back to the *De Doctrina Christiana,* of St. Augustine, in which he depicts his ideal ecclesiastical orator. The number of contemporary works on the subject is rapidly increasing. A short bibliography is appended to this report.

Not every one will agree that modern preaching bears witness to the effectiveness of seminary training in public speaking. But the investigation of this committee seems to show that practically all the seminaries place a very considerable emphasis on this training, in one form or another. If it is not effective, your committeeman is more inclined to fall back upon the opinion of Isocrates, that natural ability is of more consequence than training, and to question the capacity of the students rather than to propose a reform of the instruction.

Such instruction as is here described, however, does raise questions which have a bearing upon most of the problems discussed in this convention. An interpretation of the facts here presented would be valuable and interesting, but cannot now be undertaken.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BEECHER, H. W.: Yale lectures on preaching. 1889.
BROADUS, J. A.: Preparation and delivery of sermons. 1870.
BROOKS, PHILLIPS: Yale lectures on preaching. 1877.
BROWN, C. R.: The art of preaching. 1922.
BULL, P. B.: Preaching and sermon construction. 1922.
CARPENTER, W. B.: Lectures on preaching. 1894.
DARGAN, E. C.: History of preaching. 1905.
EMERSON, R. W.: The preacher. Lectures and biographical sketches. 1891.
FAUNCE, W. H. P.: The educational ideal in the ministry. 1908.
GARDNER, C. S.: Psychology and preaching. 1918.
GOULD, S. B.: Post-mediaeval preachers. 1865.
GREER, D. H.: The preacher and his place. 1895.
HOYT, A. S.: Vital elements in preaching. 1914.
The work of preaching. 1909.
The pulpit and American life. 1921.
MAHAFFY, J. P.: The decay of modern preaching. 1882.
POTTER, T. J.: The spoken word; or the art of extemporary preaching, its utility, its danger, and its true idea. 1880.
STORRS, R. S.: Conditions of success in preaching without notes. 1875.
WILKINSON, W. C.: Modern masters of pulpit discourse. 1905.

PUBLIC SPEAKING IN COLLEGES OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND UNITED Y. M. C. A. SCHOOLS

G. ROWLAND COLLINS
New York University

COLLEGES OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

THIS survey of the teaching of speech in colleges of Business Administration was conducted by sending questionnaires to and examining the catalogs of thirty colleges and universities. Eighteen of these institutions offer instruction in commerce in formally organized colleges of Business Administration, three offer instruction in commerce as courses in study under the administration of colleges of Engineering, and nine offer instruction in commerce as courses of study under the administration of colleges of Arts.

In the case of the nine colleges and universities offering courses in Business Administration under the administration of colleges of Liberal Arts, the instruction in Speech is identically the same as that offered in the freshman year of the courses in Liberal Arts. The emphasis is upon voice-production and platform action. The exercise material used is essentially literary and cultural. The speech assignments are general and philosophical. No attempt is made to differentiate students specializing in commerce from students of the liberal arts. The required instruction varies from one hour per week throughout the freshman year to two hours per week for one semester. From study of several curricula it would seem that the student of Business Administration would usually be unable to elect further work in Speech and at the same time complete a program leading to a degree in the normal period.

In the case of the three universities offering instruction in Business Administration under the administration of colleges of Engineering, the instruction in Speech in two universities is given in a required course in Engineering English. These two courses are three-hour required courses offered for one year. The instruction in Speech is entirely supplementary to the instruction in written composition and rhetoric. The instructors are, of course, primarily instructors in English. The emphasis is upon voice-produc-

tion and platform action. Some effort is made to assign speech topics that deal with engineering and business material. The remaining institution of this class offers a two-hour course in Oral English required of seniors for one semester. This course emphasizes speech-construction and offers some practice in the oral reading of technical papers.

Of the eighteen institutions maintaining formally organized colleges of Business Administration twelve offer no instruction whatever in Speech.

Six institutions offer specialized courses in Speech in the curricula of their colleges of Business Administration. These courses seem to emphasize the analysis and synthesis of speech-material. Speech assignments deal with business topics. The project method is largely used. Actual business occasions are approximated. The treatment of voice-production and platform action is reduced to a minimum. The point of view is practical. The colleges of Business Administration of Boston University, Columbia University, Northwestern University and New York University seem to have developed this type of instruction to a marked degree. The courses vary from a required one-hour course throughout the year to a two-hour elective course throughout the year. Approximately 400 students are enrolled each year in the course at Boston University, approximately 150 at Columbia, and approximately 500 at New York University.

To obtain information from practical and successful business men as to the need for instruction in Speech in colleges of Business Administration a questionnaire was sent to fifty executives located in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. The list included industrial managers, comptrollers and accounting directors, sales managers, market investigators, financiers and merchandizers. About thirty of the executives to whom questionnaires were sent are college-trained men with academic degrees in Liberal Arts or Pure Science; five are graduates of engineering colleges, five are graduates of colleges of Business Administration, and the balance are men with little or no academic training.

The following questions are typical of the questions asked in the questionnaire.

1. **Should instruction in Speech be given in Colleges of Business Administration?**

2. Should the emphasis be placed upon Voice-production or upon Speech construction?
3. Should the instruction be highly specialized and practical or general and cultural?
4. In your opinion, what is the principal fault of present-day business speakers?
5. Is the Y. M. C. A. meeting the needs of the young business man in respect to instruction in Speech?

An overwhelming majority of the forty replies received stated in no uncertain terms that instruction in Speech should be given in colleges of Business Administration. The replies were practically unanimous in pointing out the importance of ability in speech-making to the business man.

Thirty of the forty replies stated that the treatment of voice-production should be minimized. Typical replies read as follows:

"Teach students to persuade—not to declaim."
"We have enough actors in the business world now."
"Thinking is the important thing. The mechanics are secondary."
"Cut out the poetry. Make your speakers vital."
"In college we called Public Speaking 'Public Squeaking.' Is it still that?"

Thirty-two of the replies stated that the instruction should be specialized and practical rather than general and cultural. Typical replies were:

"What the young business man needs to know is the 'How to Do' and not simply the 'What to Do'. Be practical at all costs."
"Business demands results. We want more polish, of course, but not at the expense of effectiveness. Competition demands convincing speaking. Learned speaking is of little value."
"Give your students all the liberal culture you can. They will need it, and they'll never get it later."

Various opinions were expressed in regard to the principal faults of the present-day business speaker. The following replies are typical:

"He talks too long. He won't take time enough to prepare a short talk."
"Too many stories, and too much vaudeville."
"The average business man is mechanical and artificial in speaking formally."

"Most business talks are too heavy. Most of them pay little heed to the 'You Attitude'."

Fifteen of the replies condemned the teaching of Speech as it is done by the Y. M. C. A. schools. Five were non-committal, and eight indicated a belief that the Y. M. C. A. courses were valuable. The following replies are samples.

"The 'Y' courses are inspirational bunk."

"No intelligent business man wastes his time more than once."

"College is the place for Public Speaking courses. The Y. M. C. A. is doing a great deal, however, for the older man."

"Silent Sims at his worst."

"I have insisted that my son shall take every course in Speaking that he can at his college. He took two courses last summer. The 'Y' course is practical and valuable. The colleges should do more of this work."

From the results of this survey the following tentative conclusions would seem to be justified:

1. There is recognition of the value of training in Speech on the part of a relatively large number of business executives.
2. Business men seem to feel that effective persuasion should be the primary aim of courses for students of business administration and not merely graceful exhibition.
3. A large number of executives believe that instruction in Speech should be practical rather than cultural.
4. There is a strong feeling that more instruction in Speech should be offered by colleges of Business Administration.

The principal difficulties which hinder the development of specialized instruction in Speech in colleges of Business Administration seem to be:

1. The lack of appropriate texts for such a course.
2. The difficulty in obtaining instructors who have the combination of sound academic training and practical business experience.
3. The hostility of many academic departments of Speech toward specialized instruction.
4. The difficulty of finding a place and a time for specialized instruction in Speech in the majority of the course-programs of the colleges of Business Administration.

THE UNITED Y. M. C. A. SCHOOLS.

This survey was conducted by an examination of the standardized texts, lectures and projects of the United Y. M. C. A. Schools' course in Public Speaking, and by interviews with several Y. M. C. A. educational directors, instructors and students.

The United Y. M. C. A. Schools conduct a standardized course in Public Speaking. Actual class-room instruction is given in every city of 25,000 people or more, in which the Y. M. C. A. maintains a permanent organization. In New York City, courses in Public Speaking are offered in eleven different centers. Approximately three hundred students are enrolled in these metropolitan courses.

An elaborate correspondence course based upon the standardized course has been offered until the beginning of the past month. The correspondence work has now been discontinued so far as new students are concerned.

The basis of the course is a series of four texts on Public Speaking written by Dale Carnagey. These texts are supplemented by a series of eight lectures entitled as follows:

Public Speaking, by Orisons Swett Marden.
Courage—A Sales Manager to His Men, by Holman.
Addresses That Win in Business. Selected.
The Voice and the Man, by Professor Robert J. Hughes.
Acres of Diamonds, by Russell H. Conwell.
Silent Eloquence, by Warren C. Du Bois.
Famous Speeches. Selected.
As a Man Thinketh, by James Lane Allen.

Four projects in pamphlet form are used as assignments to accompany the texts and the lectures. The projects are detailed and specific. They include a talk to a club, a lecture to employes, a talk to an official Social Club, a political speech to a Mass Meeting, to a Chamber of Commerce Banquet, etc.

The entire course was submitted to a list of ten people who were asked for an honest judgment in reply to questions concerning the value of the course. The list of ten included:

One lawyer.
Two academic teachers of Speech.
Two business executives.
One editor (Business Trade Journal).
One Physician.
Two Ministers.

One City Manager.

The replies received would seem to indicate the following conclusions:

1. **The text material is totally inadquate in amount and content.**
2. **There is no logical or psychological arrangement.**
3. **The subject of Personality is over-emphasized and loosely treated.**
4. **There is an unnecessary amount of "pep stuff" and inspirational material.**
5. **The supplementary lectures are not related to the work of the course by assignment or by sufficient discussion.**
6. **The projects are useful and practical.**

Ten different Y. M. C. A. classes in Public Speaking were visited and ten different instructors interviewed. The general impression gained was that the methods of instruction in the majority of cases are pedagogically and psychologically unsound. Unquestionably some worthwhile results are obtained but the remarks of one of the Y. M. C. A. instructors, a Hamilton College alumnus, a thorough student of Speech and an able teacher, are considered significant:

> **"The principal thing the Y. M. C. A. course accomplishes is to impart self-confidence. I don't pretend to develop accomplished persuaders. Their text feeds them inspirational courage. I pile on more and eventually I get results. It is something of a pity. You know how dangerous self-confidence is without anything else along with it."**

Another outstanding fact is that many of the instructors are not equipped to teach Speech adequately. Many are not college graduates and many have had no academic training whatever. Many are totally unfamiliar with the literature of speech-making. Many are active in business or in a profession and have no real interest in their work.

EDITORIAL

TEN YEARS OF SERVICE.

WITH this issue the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION completes its tenth volume and its tenth year of useful service. During its period of existence the academic teaching of speech subjects has immeasurably improved, and the arts and sciences of speech have seen a remarkable advance. It would not be too much to say that the QUARTERLY JOURNAL and the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION have played an important part in this progress. To many teachers throughout the country, including some who find it impossible to attend the national conventions, the JOURNAL has become well nigh indispensable—not because it is any better than it should be, but because it is the one clearing-house for ideas in a profession of ideas. If those who thus value it would signify their appreciation by a birthday gift, let it be in the form of more contributions and more new subscribers. The JOURNAL is not, and can never be, a mercenary enterprise, but the more readers we have the greater our stability and scope of usefulness; and although we have more contributions now than we can publish, the more we receive the higher may be our standard of selection. These are obvious remarks, but appropriate for repetition every ten years or so.

OUR LEADING ARTICLES

IN the first four articles in this issue will be found a discussion of debate and a debate on discussion. Neither can be held to open a new field of controversy, but the question of the relative importance of debate and discussion in our educational economy is a live one on which the last word is yet to be said. There have been many disputes over debating since the famous attack upon that institution by the late Theodore Roosevelt in his *Autobiography;* and recently *The Outlook* has renewed this attack, inspired appar-

ently by the memory of its great Contributing Editor. A most able answer to *The Outlook's* contentions, if not to those of Mr. Roosevelt, has been written by J. M. O'Neill, and published in *The Gavel,* official organ of Delta Sigma Rho; and those who are interested in the fate of debating will find it excellent reading in conjunction with the articles here published. It is a curious circumstance that Mr. Mosher defends debating for the same reason that Mr. Roosevelt attacked it. To those who disagree with any of these writers, or feel moved to rush to their support, and to those who feel moved to discuss discussion, our Forum is invitingly open. It is in the hope of encouraging a more widespread expression of opinion on these topics that we have given them the place of emphasis.

The article on *Logic and Argumentation* should also provoke some response; certainly it has caused enough difference of opinion among the several members of our staff who have read it. Is it true that we have been neglecting Logic in our teaching of Argumentation? Is linear inference inadequate, and our system of briefing antiquated? Is there anything new for us in the "Logic of probabilities?" Is Mrs. Graham giving us new light or raking up old dust? One Assistant Editor doubts whether the readers of the JOURNAL can make head or tail of the article. Accept this please as a challenge.

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION

THE annual convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH will be held at Evanston on December 29, 30 and 31. A message from President Kay will be found on page 386 of this issue, and to it we need only add the latest news from Mr. Dennis concerning railroad fares—which is that through the courtesy of another association we shall almost certainly be able to secure the reduced rate. Detailed instructions will be mailed to all whose names appear in our Directory, and to all others who send their names to Mr. Dennis or Mr. Kay. Applications for programs should also be made to Mr. Kay, and requests for accommodations at Evanston should be made to Mr. Dennis.

Some of those who expect to attend the convention will be interested in the play contest for the Cumnock Cup to be held at

Evanston on December 31 and January 1, full announcement of which appears in our News and Notes on page 412.

OUR POLICIES

CERTAIN policies of the JOURNAL will be brought up for discussion at Evanston, and some of them settled by vote. Meanwhile we should like to hear from our readers, especially those who will not be at Evanston.

There is the question of whether the JOURNAL should be copyrighted; several members have advocated this course and have offered good arguments. If there are objections, let us have them.

It has been suggested that a classified index of the first ten volumes would be very useful to our members and to libraries. Let us have your opinions as to the advisability of this project, and your ideas as to what ought to be included. The question of cost and of distribution of labor must be faced, of course.

We should particularly like to hear from our readers as to the desirability of publishing in our book review column several different reviews of the same book. Many unsolicited reviews come in, sometimes after the books have been assigned to staff reviewers; right now we have on hand additional reviews of several books mentioned in this issue. Ought the editor to select in each case the review that seems best to him, thereby giving it editorial endorsement? Or ought he to print all well written reviews that come in—provided, of course, that they are parliamentary and not too long—so that the column will be an open Forum on books?

In general, have you any suggestions for the improvement of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL? If so, bring them to Evanston or write them to the editor.

THE FORUM

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Letters for the Forum should be direct and concise. They may be upon any topic in Speech Education, controversial or otherwise; but publication is not to be regarded as editorial endorsement, either as to form or content.]

A QUESTION FOR DISCUSSION

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—What is a successful speech? This is a question that may very well be discussed in the pages of the Quarterly Journal.

In presenting to students of speaking some speeches as models, objection is sometimes made: "But they did not accomplish their purpose." For instance, Lincoln's contributions to the Lincoln-Douglas debates are sometimes cited as great speeches; but they did not get Lincoln the necessary votes for success at the time. The speech of Socrates reported in Plato's Apology did not save Socrates' life. Was it a failure; or is it rightfully regarded as a good speech?

In the present political campaign can one really estimate the merit of Mr. Davis' or Mr. Coolidge's speeches before the election returns are in?

I should like to read the opinions of the older heads in the work upon this question. Is a speech successful, can it be held up as a model for students, even though it does not accomplish the purpose for which it was delivered?

Very truly yours,

EDWIN G. FLEMMING.

Miami University

A RETORT COURTEOUS

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—In a recent article entitled "The Relative Effectiveness of the Condensed and Extended Motive Appeal" Mr. Collins of New York University took some notice of my paper on "A

Psychological Approach to the Rhetoric of Speech Composition." His observations on the value of the rhetorical distinction between rational and motive appeal seem to me very sound. Mr. Collins knows what he is talking about—but I'm afraid he does not know what I was talking about. Perhaps no one does. This is not surprising in view of the condensed and inadequate statement I was obliged to make of my position. Unaccustomed to convention procedure, I was naïve enough to suppose that I must keep my paper within the prescribed time limit. This necessitated a confusing brevity in the treatment of several points.

In the course of his argument Mr. Collins says, "For myself, however, no matter what may happen to the 'ends' of speech and to the theoretical distinction between Belief and Volition, I believe that we still need to teach a practical distinction between rational and motive development. . . ." I hasten to agree with Mr. Collins on this point. My contention was that the distinction between belief and volition as separate ends of speech is psychologically unsound. But this implies nothing regarding the theoretical soundness or the practical utility of the distinction between those two rhetorical methods which Mr. Collins has called "rational appeal" and "motive appeal." The belief that an attack upon the psychological belief-volition distinction is an indirect attack upon the rhetorical rational-motive distinction might be supposed to spring from the erroneous impression that rational appeal is used solely to induce belief, and motive appeal to induce volition. But no one believes this, least of all Mr. Collins, who has constructed for experimental purposes two speeches, both designed to induce belief, but one purely rational and the other purely emotional in its appeal. Either appeal may be used to secure undivided attention to an idea, whether that undivided attention is designed to produce belief or action; my point was that a consideration of the "end" of the speech (belief or action) could not guide the speaker in his choice of rhetorical method.

Later in his discussion Mr. Collins says: "I accept the psychological point of view that what I am calling rational development is in terms of attention usually an effort (1) to call into the conscious mind of the hearer the idea to be believed, and (2) to dispose of inhibitory ideas. And I accept the psychological point of view that what I am calling motive development is in terms of attention usually an effort to (3) intensify the idea." Mr. Collins'

acceptance of this point of view is very gracious, but from whom does he accept it? Certainly not from me. Rational appeal may be used to intensify an idea as well as to dispose of inhibitory ideas. To be more specific, the purpose of constructive argument is to intensify the speaker's idea; the purpose of refutation is to dispose of hostile ideas. But motive appeal may also be used to accomplish both of these two ends, though for the permanent disposal of inhibitory ideas it is doubtless less effective than logical refutation.

In the closing paragraphs of his article Mr. Collins points out "two particularly dangerous possibilities we face if in our teaching we push too far the thesis that there is no theoretical or practical distinction between rational development and motive development. . . ." But since, so far as I am aware, no one is supporting this thesis, I presume we need not fear, or discuss, the "dangerous possibilities." I am heartily in sympathy with Mr. Collins' desire to "emphasize the distinction between the two appeals, to encourage the recognition and use of both, and to attempt to control the quality and particularly the *extent* of both."

One purpose of this letter is to express my keen interest in Mr. Collins' attempt to apply the experimental method to the study of rhetoric. The problem is indeed a difficult one. I cannot at present see any escape from this dilemma: If the experimenter employs a technic sufficiently elaborate to secure what a scientist would recognize as effective laboratory control, he makes the situation so artificial and so unlike that confronting the public speaker that the student of rhetoric cannot safely infer anything from his results. If, on the other hand, he maintains a true speaker-audience situation, his laboratory technic is apt to be too inaccurate for trustworthy results. The latter is the horn of the dilemma which seems to gore the experimenters at New York University—but Mr. Collins' evaluation of his own work is so modest that it disarms criticism.

Very possibly there is an escape from the dilemma for those who are willing to hunt for it. If Mr. Collins and his colleagues succeed in perfecting an experimental method for the study of rhetoric, their work will mark a new era in the study of the subject.

Very truly yours,

WM. E. UTTERBACK,
Dartmouth College.

ASSOCIATION NEWS

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION

All teachers of speech should bear in mind the meeting of the National Association which is to be held at Evanston, Illinois, from December 29 to 31, inclusive. The building of the Department of Speech of Northwestern University has been placed at the disposal of the Association and will be the meeting place.

This assures us the best accommodation the association has ever enjoyed. The assembly hall is equipped with an adequate stage and all accessories needful for demonstration purposes. It will seat three hundred persons comfortably. Additional rooms provide suitable accommodation for committee and departmental meetings. The acoustic properties of the auditorium are such as to insure that neither speaker nor listener will have to exert himself unduly to hear or be heard.

Certain new features will be stressed at this convention. In the first place preparations are being made to make this meeting outstanding for its friendly tone. Mrs. Perle Shale Kingsley of the University of Denver, and Mr. Harry B. Gough of De Pauw University have been appointed official hostess and host respectively. They have selected an excellent committee to coöperate with them in plans for seeing that every teacher who attends the convention has a chance to become acquainted with all the other teachers present; they will have headquarters at which members can obtain such help and information as they will require to make their visit pleasant and profitable: informal entertainment will be planned for those who spend their evenings in Evanston. The papers to be read will be selected for their informing and discussion-provoking qualities rather than to give someone a chance to appear on the program. More time will be apportioned to informal discussion and less to the reading of papers. Departmental meetings will be arranged for those interested in special subjects and an effort will be made to avoid conflicts between closely allied departments.

Another outstanding feature of this convention, if proposed plans can be carried through, will be the introduction of more demonstration and less abstract discussion. It is probable that demonstration will be given of new devices for classroom use in voice production and development. New methods of stage lighting and setting will be shown by experts. Publishers will be asked to offer for inspection all books which they have treating on subjects dealing with speech and closely allied subjects.

This will be the last opportunity of reaching you through the QUARTERLY. Special notices with detailed announcement of the program will be mailed to all members of the association. Others wishing the announcement whose names are not on the mailing list should send their request to the president.

Professor Ralph B. Dennis of Northwestern University will arrange for the lodging accommodation in Evanston of all who write to him and request it.

The men of the Association may secure rooms in the college dormitories on the North Campus at $2.00 a day; the women may have rooms in the women's dormitories at $1.50 a day. A meeting room at the Orrington Hotel will be open on the night of the 28th as a gathering place for those who arrive early. Other hotels near the campus are the North Shore and the Library Plaza. The Evanshire and the Evanston are a mile away, but connected by street railway. Evanston may be reached from Chicago by the Northwestern Railway in about twenty minutes or by the electric railway from the Loop in about fifty minutes.

Cordially yours,

WILBUR JONES KAY, *President*
West Virginia University,
Morgantown.

THE MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

The following have been appointed to constitute the Membership Committee of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH:

Dwight E. Watkins, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Miss Sallie Sharp, 303 W. 21st St., Wilmington, Del.
Miss Anne T. Renshaw, 1603 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C.
Irving C. Stover, 201 Minnesota Ave., De Land Fla.
W. N. Brigance, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.
W. C. Dennis, Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa.

R. Norvelle, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Bromley Smith, Baltimore, Md.
H. L. Ewbank, Albion College, Albion, Mich.
E. D. Schonberger, University Station, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
George McCarty, South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. Dak.
A. M. Harris, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
W. E. Davison, 13 Elm St., Middlebury, Vt.
Miss Virginia Patterson, 110 Jefferson Ave., Moundsville, W. Va.
Miss Gertrude Johnson, 237 Langdon St., Madison, Wis.
H. H. Higgins, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
Enid Miller, Nebraska Wesleyan.
Maynard L. Daggy, State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
Earl W. Wells, Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Ore.
Miss Bessie Jackson, Danuba, Calif.
Howard W. Woodward, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O.

J. T. MARSHMAN, *Chairman*
Ohio Wesleyan University,
Delaware, Ohio

LAST MINUTE NOTICE

THROUGH the courtesy of the American Economic Association CONVENTION RAILROAD RATES HAVE BEEN GRANTED FOT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Buy your ticket to Chicago, not Evanston.
2. Buy it for date between December 25 and 31.
3. Ask for a convention certificate when you buy it.
4. On arriving at Evanston present your certificate to our secretary, who will take care of the validation.
5. Certificates are not kept at all stations. Find out in advance the nearest point from which you can purchase ticket and obtain certificate. Your local station agent can tell you.
6. A similar certificate may be obtained for each dependent member of your family who accompanies you.
7. On proper validation the certificate will enable you to purchase a return ticket from Chicago by the same route at one-half fare.
8. Validation is dependent upon an attendance of 250 members, but there are eight associations in the group so that the chance of failure is slight.

Laboratory and Research

A COMMERCIAL DEVICE APPRAISED

THE TELEGRAPHONE. Manufactured by the American Telegraphone Company, Springfield, Mass. Also Equipped with Standard Acousticon.

For about three months the laboratory of the Department of Speech of the University of Wisconsin has been testing the telegraphone. The telegraphone, or perhaps more properly, the magnetophone is a device for recording and reproducing sounds, tones, or signals transmitted from a distance by electric impulses conducted by wire. The recording is not accomplished as in the phonograph by impress upon a wax disk or cyinder, but by the magnetizing of a steel wire which is drawn rapidly through the electromagnetic field of the receiver, so that the sound produced at a distance and transmitted in the form of electric impulses over the wire does not activate a diaphragm, but rather makes its record in the form of changes in the magnetism from point to point along the record wire. The acousticon may be mounted in the class room with a control box upon the teacher's desk and a concealed pedal switch under the desk so that speeches actually made to the class may be recorded without the knowledge of the speaker or of the class.

We have been for some time recording phonographically the voices of our students. This we believe to be significantly valuable to the student in the study of his own voice. However, talking to the phonograph and talking to a class are two quite different processes; we want to be able to show the student how he actually sounds in a real speech before the class.

Our investigation of this machine leads us to the following conclusions: The speeches of the students may be recorded telegraphonically with great convenience and simplicity. The device does not necessitate the presence of a second operator in the laboratory, the teacher in the class room controls the machine in the laboratory without so much as giving the slightest sign of his doing so. The voice is clearly recorded provided the speaker stands squarely in front of the acousticon and is recorded with a considerable volume if he stands within three or four feet of it. Speakers with loud voices may stand twelve to fifteen feet away from the acousticon and be recorded efficiently. The only difficulty with

this machine is that the acousticon is so delicately sensitive that it not only records the voice of the speaker but records other extraneous noises and echoes. Such noises and echoes are eliminated by a process of perception when one listens to the actual speaker but appear as slight distortions when the same combination of sounds is reproduced from the record. Proper care in the mounting of the acousticon so as to eliminate these extraneous noises effectively obviates this difficulty. The convenience of the apparatus must be mentioned in all fairness. One can record the speech made in the class room, run the record back to the point at which the speech started, or to any other point desired by the teacher, attach the telephone receivers to the control box and listen to the record without going to the laboratory at all. If the speaker then desires to change a part of what he has recorded, he may make such change immediately without the bother of substituting a new record wire or of first erasing the record upon the wire that has just been used. The process of recording itself effectively and completely erases what was there before so that a record may be saved or erased as seems desirable. Thus, if one wishes to employ the same wire over and over again simply for the purpose of letting students hear how they sound, it involves no extra outlay for wire,— the same wire being used as many times as desired. On the other hand, should one desire to save a record and "play" it over several times, he will find it absolutely permanent.

The reaction of the students to the machine has been interesting. The possibility that their speeches may be recorded stimulates the work of the class, and when one has been recorded, he often expresses some surprise that he sounds as the reproduction indicates. On the whole, therefore, I should pronounce the machine one of the most significant mechanical devices that have been produced in modern times to help in the training of public speakers.

R. West,
University of Wisconsin.

A PERSONALITY TABLE FOR USE IN SCHOOLS

[Editorial Foreword: On making a study of the speech defects among children at the Perkins Institution for the Blind we encountered many personality difficulties, types of mal-adjustment, feelings of inferiority and inadequacy, in which the speech was merely one symptom of the underlying conditions. Miss Maxfield, psychologist at the institution, rendered valuable service to us, in the process of making our speech tests, by means of her personality studies, for which the outline is here given

We have found it serviceable in studying many cases of inadequate personality and speech disturbance, and offer it therefore as a suggestive outline for similar studies by teachers of speech elsewhere. S. M. S.]

PERSONALITY TABLE FOR USE IN SCHOOLS*

Kathryn E. Maxfield, Assistant in Psychology and Personnel
Perkins Institution for the Blind, Watertown, Mass.

Date of final rating	Date of birth	School rating
Home environment	IQ.	Music rating
School residence	M. A.	Manual rating

	1st Quartile	2d Quartile	3d Quartile	4th Quartile
I. HABITS OF WORK				
1. How diligent on work in general				
2. How diligent on favorite subject or subjects				
3. How attentive to work in general				
4. How attentive to favorite subjects				
5. How efficient in study habits				
6. How resourceful				
7. How stable—does he work evenly or by spells				
II. SOCIAL TENDENCIES				
1. How tactful				
2. How diligent on favorite subject or subjects				
3. How capable of lasting friendships				
4. How much tendency to lead				
5. How fond of sports and games				
6. How wholesome a sex life				
7. How honorable				
8. How well-balanced a relationship between egoism and altruism				
III. PSYCHIC ENERGY				
1. How capable of making the most of his intelligence				
2. How capable of seeing a project through when once started				
3. How anxious to try new things				
IV. SCHOOL FEATURES				
1. How mature, mentally, for his mental age				
2. How good at literary work				
3. How good at music				
4. How good at manual training				
V. PERSONAL PECULIARITIES				
1. How free from tics				
2. How free from tendency to act on prejudice				

SUGGESTIONS:

1. **If he has peculiarities like tics, grouchiness, sex irregularities, feeling of inferiority or too much egotism or radicalism—why?**
2. **What tics has he?**
3. **If lacking in psychic energy, why?**
4. **If uneven in his work, why?**
5. **Special weakness in his study habits?**
   Causes for poor attention?
6. **When reading or playing, does he do so constructively, or does he merely get word or sound drunk?**

* Copyright, 1924, by Kathryn E. Maxfield. Reprinted by permission.

PERSONALITY TABLE FOR USE IN SCHOOLS

Kathryn E. Maxfield, Assistant in Psychology and Personnel
Perkins Institution for the Blind, Watertown, Mass.

Explanatory Points

Heading.

Date of final rating.

So wording this makes allowance for changes in judgments which are apt to occur during the first few months of acquaintanceship with the pupils. New pupils frequently do not show their real natures until they begin to feel at home in the school.

Home environment.

Does the pupil come from an average, everyday home, or is his home above or below the average? Grade according to whether the home environment is very superior, superior, average, inferior or very inferior.

School rating, Musinc rating and Manual training rating.

Grade the same as above.

Quartiles.

Rating by quartiles involves a special attitude of mind on the part of the judge. It is necessary to eliminate the proverbial "average person." If a pupil is the best in his class, he rates in the highest 25%, or the first quartile. If he is the dullest in his class, he rates in the lowest 25% in his class, or the fourth quartile. The second and third quartile represent the middle 50% of the class, and the pupil is placed in the second quartile if he would stand somewhat above the exact average of his class, and yet could not be placed in the highest 25%. He would be rated in the third quartile if he did not quite come up to the exact average of his class, yet was not poor enough to be placed in the lowest 25%. Thus the class is divided into four sections for rating purposes.

I. Habits of work.

1-2. Does the child show a general industry in handling all his work, or is he lackadaisical and inattentive? Or is he industrious where his favorite subjects are concerned?

3-4. Does he seem to have a general ability to concentrate on whatever matter is before him, or can he attend only to those subjects in which he is especially interested?

II. Special Tendencies.

2. Can a pupil adjust himself to the particular people with whom he happens to be thrown?

6. What is the pupil's general mental attitude toward his sex life? Has he himself bad habits or not? Do you think he condones habits of this sort? Does he deliberately allow his mind to be prurient, or does he make an effort to be as clean as possible in thought and deed?

8. Does the pupil h ve the tendency to consider himself first, to think of other people as existing only for his benefit? Or does he show a normal amount of consideration for others, and interest in others?

III. Psychic Energy.

1-2-3. Every teacher has at least one pupil who is not doing the sort of work which his grade of intelligence would lead one to expect of him. With some of these pupils it is a matter of physical health, which may sometimes be remedied. With others, however, it is a lack of that stamina, or vital force, which is so necessary for accomplishment. People seriously deficient in "psychic energy" are often designated as "constitutional inferiors."

IV. School Features.

1. Does the pupil have to depend largely upon his memory in school work, or has he well-developed imagination and reasoning power for his age? Any child capable of nothing but memory work, is not mature mentally.

V. Personal Peculiarities.

1. According to Gould's Medical Dictionary, a tic is a "spasmodic twitching." For instance, a child has a tic if one side of his face twitches constantly, or if he persistently swings his head from side to side. The cause may be structural or functional.

Suggestions.

These six suggestions are added as hints merely to help the judge in the difficult task of constructively analyzing the pupil's difficulties. By "word or sound 'drunk'" is meant that passive enjoyment of sensory stimulation which many pupils seem to find in listening to reading, or in just sitting still and babbling or yelling for long periods of time. In such cases purely sensory satisfaction takes place of constructive reading or playing.

RESEARCH PAPERS IN PROCESS OR LATELY FINISHED

COMPILED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
H. A. WICHELNS, *Chairman*

The following items are supplementary to the longer lists published in the JOURNAL for June and November, 1923, and for February and June, 1924.

Barker, Juliet A. The Revolt in the French Theatre and its Development since 1880. (A. M. thesis at Northwestern University under Professor Alexander Dean; unfinished.) The date 1880 may seem arbitrary, but it does mark the approximate beginning of a revolt against certain traditional and long-stablished principles of the French theatre. It is the aim of this thesis (1) to how briefly the conditions of the French theatre before 1880; (2) to show in detail the beginning and subsequent development of the revolt; (3) to present some of the results of the change outstanding in the French theatre today, as typified in such institutions as the *Vieux Colombier* of Jacques Copeau. More specifically, the revolt was against the thesis play of Dumas *fils*, against the well-made play of Scribe and Sardou, against the conventional, commercialized theatre of the latter nineteenth century.

Hill, Evelyn. The Development of the Physical Stage. (A. M. thesis at Northwestern University under Professor Alexander Dean; unfinished.) The purpose is to describe the different physical stages of the chief periods in dramatic history; Greek, Roman, medieval, renaissance, restoration, eighteenth century, nineteenth century, present-day. The second purpose is to trace the development of the physical stage in a connected account.

Utterback, W. E. Psychological Approach to the Rhetoric of Speech Composition. (Special study at Dartmouth College; finished; published in the JOURNAL for February, 1924.) An examination, from the psychological point of view, of the conventional distinction between conviction and persuasion. Conclusion: the distinction is thoroughly unsound.

Hill, Evelyn. The Psychology of Argument. (A. M. thesis at Dartmouth College under Professor Winans.) Belief may be stated in terms of attention to the idea believed. The conditions

of attention are: (a) the initial presence in consciousness of the idea believed; (b) a connection between the idea believed and conceptual systems from which the idea can draw the "psychic energy" necessary to its maintenance in consciousness; (c) freedom from inhibitory ideas. Corresponding to these three conditions of attention there are three steps in the total process of inducing belief: (a) statement of the proposition; (b) constructive argument; (c) refutation.

Yeomans, Mabel F. The Effect of Persuasion upon the Adoption of the Federal Constitution by New York. (Ph. D. thesis at Cornell University under Professor Hunt and Professor C. H. Hull of the Department of History; unfinished.) An attempt to discover a method whereby the effect of persuasion upon public policy may be measured with some degree of accuracy and to illustrate the use of such a method by reference to a particular problem.

NEW BOOKS

PURPOSIVE SPEAKING

Purposive Speaking. By ROBERT WEST. The Macmillan Company, 1924.

In a world filled with books manufactured for sale without reference to effect, it is refreshing to find one with such a definite purpose. The more is this true when that purpose is avowedly one of discipline as is the case with Professor West's book (Preface, p. vii). To accomplish this purpose and to enforce this discipline it is necessary to lay a broad foundation in the field of psychology.

If Professor West can induce his classes to read with understanding the works listed in his preface, he will have done them a service.

His difficulty, no doubt, will lie in the widely varying backgrounds of college students. For those who have had little or no fundamental training, as indicated on p. 134, the attack upon speech making may be a little impetuous; for those who have had controlled experience (which is discipline) the book is excellent.

Probably no charge could be laid against the book which would not be refuted by the book itself, though with some delay. For example, the reader wonders why in Chapter V. p. 51 the writer does not include among the functions of the speaker that of adding to the information of the audience, while on p. 140 Professor West pays tribute to excellent exposition.

Again on pp. 111-112 we are warned against inattentive or unwilling audiences, while on p. 145 we are told "there is no such thing as an inattentive audience."

Professor West gives throughout his book clear evidence of his mastery of his field; and allowing for differences of individual method among teachers, the book is a valuable one.

D. W. REDMOND, *College of the City of New York.*

Persistent Questions in Public Discussion. By ALEXANDER M. DRUMMOND and EVERETT LEE HUNT. The Century Co., 1924. Pp. 558.

This is a collection of addresses and essays, arranged in pairs or groups according to topic, and designed to serve the student speaker as a suggestive starting point for the gathering and study of material. The topics covered are, as the title suggests, those which are most permanently with us; they include American Character and Ideals, Democracy, Liberty of Thought and Discussion, Economic Society, Education, Religion, Racial Problems, War and Peace, International Relations, Public Duty, and Public Discussion. Among the authors or speakers represented are Charles W. Eliot, Brander Matthews, Walter Bagehot, G. Lowes Dickinson, William James, Wendell Phillips, and many others.

The pity is that such a book has not been compiled before. Our colleagues in English Composition have provided themselves with a dozen, perhaps a score, of such collections adapted to the needs of the student writer. Some of us have borrowed from them for our work in public speaking. But here is a book of the same kind edited by teachers of public speaking and prepared especially for their own classes—not a book of model speeches for study as such, but a book of stimulating source material, selected with reference to its actual helpfulness in arousing discussion. Those who know the work of Mr. Drummond and Mr. Hunt in other connections need not be told that the book is well done.

No selection of material from so fertile a field could possibly satisfy everybody; there will be those who will think that this item should have been included or that one left out. But whereas most collections of the sort merely offer you the editor's selection to take or leave as you see fit, this one gives you, in the Appendix, a supplementary list of readings on each of the several topics—a copious, well chosen, and suggestive list of readings, too. Moreover—and this is perhaps the most valuable feature—it gives you a list of questions on each speech or essay by means of which the student may extract from his reading the highest degree of suggestion. Too often we put good things in the hands of students and expect them to make the most of them when, as a matter of fact, their immaturity and lack of background make it impossible for them to do so. With the aid of these questions any student not hopelessly dull

should certainly find something to say on each of the "persistent questions:" and if not hopelessly lacking in ordinary curiosity he should be enticed into reading some of the additional material suggested.

Teachers considering this volume for classroom use should not fail to read the "Word to Teachers" on page 486.

JOHN DOLMAN, Jr. *University of Pennsylvania.*

Talking Well. A Book on the Art of Conversation. By W. L. HARRINGTON and M. G. FULTON. The Macmillan Co., 1924.

This book contains approximately 100 pages of text and 100 pages of stories for re-telling and poems, mostly from Kipling, for memorizing. The chapters are as follows:

I. "Introductory." The need for better talking and for self-cultivation in English. Professors Palmer and Clapp generously quoted.

II. "Some Essentials of Good Conversation." The shallowness of conversation; sources of materials.

III. "How to Tell a Story." Values, methods; delivery.

IV. "Advice on Voice Improvement." Need of a good voice; suggestions for getting one; enunciation exercises.

V. "How to Make a Sales-Talk." Keep back the price; do most of the talking; avoid arguments; be cheery; talk quickly, etc.

VI. "Reading or Reciting a Selection." The lost art of fireside reading; avoid sing-song; memorize by whole method; practice poetry, then prose.

VII. "Platform Manners and Delivery." Formal standing position, eyes, bow, etc.

VIII. "Colloquial English." Usage, sentence formation, vocabulary, diction, pronunciation, exercises.

IX. "The Final Word." Carry on your self-cultivation.

Examination of the title and sub-title of this book and of the chapter headings shows lack of clearness and singleness of purpose. The intention, stated in the preface, to make this book a "brief, but simple and effective, set of lessons in conversational English . . . which even the teacher without special training in Public Speaking can use effectively" is neither adhered to nor realized. The book misses its mark. It does not even hit the target. It

starts out after conversation, scares up a flock of half-fledged platform speaking activities, wounds some, and comes home with a little diction in its bag and the explanation that "Nobody is going to make a good talker or speaker out of you, because good talkers and speakers are self-made."

The book by its continual use of "you" and "your" makes the young pupil, for whom it must have been intended, uncomfortably conscious that he is its immediate object. The tone of the book sounds like an old lady teacher as she pats a pupil on the head in a patronizing way and says, "Now you want to talk well, don't you."

R. D. T. HOLLISTER, *Ann Arbor, Michigan.*

Legislative Procedure. By ROBERT LUCE, *A. M.* (Formerly Lieutenant-Governor of Massachusetts, and Member of Congress). Houghton Miffln Co., 1922. Pp. 628.

What have we of the Public Speaking class-room to do with legislative rules? It must be made clear at once that this is no mere book of rules. It is, as its advertisement states, one of "four volumes treating historically, descriptively, and critically the legislative branch of government in every aspect." The companions are *Legislative Assemblies, Legislative Principles,* and *Legislative Problems.*

For us the significant fact about this admirably conceived and well executed book is that it contains about seventy-five pages of history and criticism of debate and oratory of English and American legislative assemblies, with an accurate analysis of the status of congressional public speaking today. And the importance of the legislature, whether state or national, as being at once the type of all deliberative bodies and the chief arena of deliberative speaking, gives this volume an additional claim upon our attention.

That debate, one of the oldest and most precious bulwarks of Anglo-Saxon liberty, is a modern invention, is the first of Mr. Luce's contentions in his chapter on that subject. He speaks of the so-called debates held previous to the seventeenth century in England as "set speeches" and "eloquent orations." He next discusses the reasons for addressing debate to the chairman, the advantage of having the opponents of a bill speak first, and other requisites of an orderly and profitable debate. This apt quotation

from John Bright closes an illuminating discussion upon the value of debate in a deliberative body: "There is much shower and much sunshine between the sowing and the reaping of the harvest, but the harvest is generally reaped after all."

In his study of "Oratory Past and Present" Mr. Luce begins and ends with the theory that we cannot properly say that oratory is in a state of decay, as we have no adequate means of comparison. He quotes many commentators to show that public speaking is as valuable, important, and effective today as yesterday. The reasons for the more concise, business-like speaking of today are said to be: (1) broad questions of public policy furnish fewer topics for discussion; and technical, administrative subjects demand a less heightened mode of speaking; (2) closure and increased desire on the part of legislators to be heard have compelled brevity.

Most interesting is Mr. Luce's statement, "Men are not in agreement as to what constitutes good speaking." It seems never to have occurred to him that there may be a science or professors of Public Speaking. (Query: But would the doctors agree?) One standard to which he subscribes is that "A man must speak so he may be heard," which is said to be "a rare quality" in legislatures. There seems to me something contradictory between these statements:

> "If a speaker is willing to enunciate distinctly, he may succeed without the help of a single one of the graces of oratory."
>
> "The fortunate possessor of the bell-like voice with a *timbre* delighting the ear, the skillful elocutionist, the master of good English —all are helped by their natural or acquired powers to get a hearing, but it amounts to little or nothing unless something worth hearing is said."

Evidently Mr. Luce has never considered that having something to say might be accounted among "the graces of oratory." At all events, his conclusion is that "In a legislative assembly, matter counts for more than manner."

It is impossible even to suggest here Mr. Luce's many sagacious precepts and observations bearing on problems in Public Speaking. An entertaining and leisurely style, with frequent quotations from a wide range of authorities, from Cicero to "The Nation," make the book easy to read. I cannot refrain from quoting a few sentences:

> "In Greek and Roman times there was plenty of oratory but little of discussion."

"Clergymen would find themselves more effective if they would not keep behind a pulpit. . . . The practical speaker will not interpose even so much as a sheet of paper between himself and his audience."

"The essay prepared in the library helps a man little toward becoming a leader of men. To achieve that distinction he must by much practice learn to meet their vanities, foibles, prejudices, and passions face to face, controlling them by words that seem to spring unbidden to the tongue."

"Bombast no longer delights. . . . England tired of grandiloquence before it palled on us—probably never was so fond of it, for Americans developed unusual aptitude for hyperbole and it was enjoyed."

RUSSELL H. WAGNER, *Ames, Iowa*

Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance. By DONALD LEMEN CLARK. New York. Columbia University Press, 1922. Pp. x+161.

Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. By CHARLES SEARS BALDWIN. New York. Macmillan, 1924. Pp. xi+261.

Professor Clark undertakes to trace the influence of classical rhetoric on the criticisms of poetry published in England between 1553 and 1641. He offers a brief exposition of classical rhetoric and poetic, together with an account of their confusion in periods of decadence. The rhetoric which the middle ages inherited was the sophistical rhetoric, pre-occupied with style, and applying the same artifices to both rhetoric and poetic. The poetic of the Renaissance was dominated by the medieval rhetoric until the recovery of classical literature and literary criticism. The second part of the book is concerned with the purpose of poetry. Classical conceptions, allegorical interpretations of the medieval period, and rhetorical elements of both the Italian and English Renaissance, are discussed. The traditional view that the proper end of poetry is moral improvement is accounted for largely by the rhetorical belief that the poet, no less than the orator, is occupied with persuasion. Professor Clark's study of these critical perversions is intended as an object lesson. Aristotle and Longinus did not allow their theories of poetry to be "contaminated by rhetoric;" modern critics should learn from them.

Professors Baldwin and Clark agree that the ancients saw the movement of rhetoric as primarily intellectual, a progress from idea to idea, determined logically; while poetic was primarily imaginative, a progress from image to image, determined emotionally. Professor Baldwin, however, emphasizes to a greater degree

the pedagogical import of this distinction between these two typical habits of composing: "The four 'forms of discourse' widely accepted by American text-books naturally combine into exposition and argument under rhetoric on the one hand, and on the other, description and narration under poetic." Another practical application from classical rhetoric is the correlation of rhetorical training with history, sociology, economics, and politics.

Professor Baldwin states the purpose of his volume to be the interpretation of ancient rhetoric and poetic afresh from typical theory and practice. As representative of theory he presents analyses of the *Rhetoric* and *Poetic* of Aristotle, the *Orator* and *De Oratore* of Cicero, the *De Institutione Oratoria* of Quintilian, *Declamatio* in Seneca, Tacitus, and Pliny, Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Sentences, and "Longinus on the Sublime." Under the heading "Poetic in Ancient Drama and Narrative" he discusses Greek tragedy, Senecan tragedy, Latin Comedy, the *Aeneid*, the narrative poetry of Ovid, and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. As examples of the pervasive influence of rhetoric in criticism, Horace's *Ars Poetica* and Plutarch's *How Youth Should Read Poetry* are included.

Professor Baldwin's interpretation of Aristotelian rhetoric is especially illuminating. His translation of Aristotle's statement concerning delivery (Rhetoric, Bk. 3) indicates that Aristotle did not have the "philosophic contempt" for style and delivery usually attributed to him.

The bibliographies at the head of Professor Baldwin's chapters, and the notes in both volumes, are very useful.

It may be remarked that in freeing literary criticism from the contamination of rhetoric, much has been accomplished; in constructing a pedagogy which recognizes the classical distinction between rhetoric and poetic, much less has been achieved; and in the creation of a literary criticism of persuasive discourse based upon sound rhetoric, almost everything remains to be done.

E. L. HUNT, *Cornell University.*

Art of Preaching: 48th Series of Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching. By CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN, Dean of the Divinity School of Yale University. Macmillan, 1922.

What Is Your Name? By CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN. Yale Press, 1924.

'We have not had for thirty years a series of Lyman Beecher Lectures dealing directly with the technique of preaching.' Thus Dean Brown explains how his book came to be filled mainly with practical suggestions as to the art of preaching. The suggestions will interest teachers of public speaking because they reveal what a notably successful preacher thinks young ministers ought to know. But the advice will not be new, radical, far-reaching, nor systematic. It is the practical speaker's daily food.

Equally as interesting as the substance of Dean Brown's Beecher Lectures is the mode of treatment: the development, perhaps because of the lecture form, is slow, but there is ample buttressing of the points with concrete detail. A good book, not an unusual one.

In the second volume under review, we find the teacher of homiletics practising what he preaches about the art of preaching. The sermons printed by the Yale Press were delivered with success as chapel talks before Yale undergraduates, and repeated on occasion in other colleges. They follow the specifications of the *Art of Preaching*: reasonable compass, ethical rather than theological bias, illustration (used more heavily than the *Art* prescribes, but not more than it practises), imagination, a concrete vocabulary not afraid of slang, and (in the series) variety of sermon plan.

H. A. WICHELNS, *Cornell University.*

Fifty Years of Chautauqua. By HUGH A. ORCHARD. The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1923.

To one who has had ten years of experience as morning educational lecturer, advance agent, and platform superintendent in Chautauqua, there comes a great temptation, in attempting to review a book like Hugh A. Orchard's "Fifty Years of Chautauqua," to express what one feels and thinks about Chautauqua rather than to attempt any comment on the place and importance of this particular book in the literature of Public Speaking. If one has had any experience at all in Chautauqua, he surely must feel the lure of it as he peruses the pages of this lucid historical sketch. One

can not read very far in this book without a full consciousness that the author is transmitting the spirit of the Chautauqua movement to the reader. There is little wonder that the author is able to do this when once something is known of his fitness to write on this theme.

At the first flush, one is impressed by the suggestiveness of the title—"Fifty Years of Chautauqua"—its beginning, its development, and its life. Such a title at once indicates to our minds that the Chautauqua movement is not something wholly in the past—that it is not a movement yet completed—but rather that it is a movement about which some future historian will write more, as the evolution goes on and on. The author does not pretend, nor does he claim to have said the last word or even to have given a detailed history of this distinctly American movement.

When one has finished reading this composition, one thinks of it in form and content as he might think of a great big family genealogy. Mother Chautauqua begat Clear Lake Chautauqua, Clear Lake Chautauqua begat Monona Lake Chautauqua, Monona Lake Chautauqua begat Miami Valley Chautauqua, etc. The author begins with a history of the conception, the birth, and travail, the growth in stature and wisdom, the inter-marriage, and multiplication on earth of this great Chautauqua idea. Mr. Orchard himself says that he has sought to assemble the constituent parts of a rather loosely related modern giant, and to photograph the composite soul. He might have said further, for the book gives the impression (and it is true), that the giant is still in its adolescent period of development.

Philosophically, not technically or practically, this book holds interest for the Public Speaking teacher. We as teachers are interested theoretically at least in an institution where some of the philosophy that we teach is either put into effective practice or is smashed into 'smithereens'. Many of our pet theories are weighed in the balance here and found wanting. If Public Speaking teachers want to find out how their philosophies work in practice, I would advise them to go to school for a few years, in intimate study, to Chautauqua. Here I have found speakers, interpreters, and actors making great impressions on crowds—mind you I do not say successes in all cases—who have never studied in any school or department of speech; and so have I seen those who have had

the finest advantages in schools or departments of expression, making apparently dismal failures.

This book is a pioneer and therefore it is impossible to compare it with others in the field. Personally, I am impressed with the incompleteness of it all; it deals with an incompleted movement. I question very much whether the value and gain in reading this book is commensurate with the time consumed—time that might be put to better service. Teachers of speech might have been more interested if Mr. Orchard had gone into a detailed account of the history and the methods of success and failure of the actors and interpreters and the orators who from time to time have graced the Chautauqua platform. We should like to know more of the times without number where the fatal gift of eloquence on the Chautauqua platform has found words more easily than thought and where deep feeling has confused utterance.

It remains yet for someone to write a more intimate history of the Chautauqua platform itself. We are not so much interested in the business development of the Chautauqua movement. The author has well fulfilled his original purpose, but as teachers of speech we long for another version of the whole story.

J. T. MARSHMAN, *Ohio Wesleyan University*

IN THE PERIODICALS

ARTICLES REVIEWED

DRUMMOND, A. M., *Play Production for the Country Theatre.* Cornell Extension Bulletin No. 82.

An unusually fine piece of work, thoroughly adequate for its purpose. Indeed, to anyone acquainted with the average bulletin it is a delightful surprise. There is as much information in it as in most books on amateur dramatics now on sale. The pictures, of which there are a large number, are illuminating, especially the drawings. The bulletin covers the vital matters of amateur production, in compact form of course, but with unerring suggestiveness. The skeleton hints are nuggets of common sense; mere samples, evidently, from the everyday teaching of a man who has had large experience in dramatic work and in dealing with student players. Instead of making a lofty gesture and referring us to the local art association or the librarian, Mr. Drummond seems to have discovered that there are many places in the United States which for practical purposes are a thousand miles from such assistance. Hence his valuable suggestions for home-made devices, and his priceless encouragement to amateurs with none of the advantages. There is a practical wisdom about the entire bulletin that invites confidence.

J. W. R.

AIKMAN, DUNCAN, *The Statesman as Artist.* The American Mercury, 3:9, p. 43. September, 1924.

The author's thesis is that American political rhetoric broke away from prevailing English models in Patrick Henry, who uttered "short, staccato, barking sentences, vicious, bayonet-thrust cadences. . . . Such lyric fierceness and energy had hardly been touched off in free verse since King James' scholars translated the Song of

Deborah." The great period of our oratory ended, however, with the Civil War. "From the Stamp Act to Appomattox brains were necessary in American public life. . . . Through all the great debates of the first century runs a glamorous sense of artists at work with living materials." Since 1865 a "bastard parody" of poetry and romance has displaced true political oratory. "The Blaines and the Voorheeses inherited the places of the Websters and the Calhouns. . . . John Sharp Williams, the last representative of the aristocratic tradition in the Senate, retired of his own volition because he found the surroundings intolerable."

Mr. Aikman's conclusion is vigorous and provocative:

> "Will our political speech and writing ever recapture what once gave worth to its exalted moments—fresh melodiousness, aristocratic and charming thought, vital intensity of interest? The liver of the national political goose is inauspicious. In the past decade a foreign war of revolutionary character has been fought. Four amendments have been added to the Constitution, vitally altering the basic theory of our government. But not a single vanished excellence has been brought back to life. Each enterprise was rushed through on the wings of sentimental piffle—the last degeneracy of the lyrical mood—and of organized propaganda—the last degeneracy of logical seduction."

BOK, EDWARD W., *The Lip-Lazy American*, Century, 108:4, p. 513. August, 1924.

A well-intentioned but unintelligent plea for more training in enunciation and articulation. With reference to the general subject of voice and speech training, Mr. Bok says: "Yet apparently we pay not the slightest attention to the almost complete absence of a study of the subject in our schools and colleges, save in two or three colleges." The *Century* should know better, or at least ask someone who knows what he is talking about to write its articles.

H. H. H.

FORUM, 72:4, p. 548, *The Human Voice Divine*, by "The Pedestrian." October, 1924.

"In a movie palace I feel like the little slum girl sent for the summer to a New England farm. Half-way through the first meal she broke the steadfast silence with a passionate cry: 'For God's sake, somebody *speak!*' . . . Teach the children to speak

and appreciate the values of speech; let them grow into human beings who realize that mind communicates with mind not merely through words but through tone of voice, through words given life and significance; treat dramatics and voice training not as an 'extra' but as an important part of the school work,— the next generation will do the rest. 'Better Speech Week' may have its virtues. What we need, though, is a Better Speech Decade."

PEARSON, E. L., *Unfettered Eagles*, Scribner's, 76:1, p. 61. July, 1924.

"Is there something in the air or the climate of the continent" which causes the bombast and length of American patriotic oratory? At any rate it cannot be as bad today as yesterday if Mr. Pearson's very racy account of the 4th-of-July oratory of 1810 and thereabouts is correct. This article suggests much bibliography for the student of American oratory. Well illustrated with interesting quotations.

R. H. W.

THOMPSON, CHARLES WILLIS, *Lincoln and Undying Oratory*. The New York Times Magazine, September 7, 1924.

Mr. Thompson asserts that Lincoln set a new fashion of simplicity in American oratory, a fashion which "came swiftly into universal favor except in the South. To this day there remains something floral about the speeches of that region." He finds that the Lincolnian simplicity had favorably affected college orations of the '80s and '90s. He quotes from the oration upon Iago with which Robert La Follette won an interstate contest at Iowa City in 1879 and from the oration upon labor and capital with which Albert Beveridge won a similar contest at Columbus, Ohio, in 1885, pointing out that Lincoln, rather than Sumner or Webster, seems to have been the stylistic model of these young men. "Beveridge and La Follette are typical of all the rest. The change had come. Since then what has been done has been to improve the diction somewhat, not to coarsen it or degrade it into commonplace. Men still love eloquence as they love poetry. It was this that first gave Woodrow Wilson his great command of men's minds, and it always remained one of the sharpest weapons in his armory. Simplicity was an art with him, and the same thrill intoxicated

men at one of his seemingly artless sentences as would have been the case with some beautiful couplet of poetry. What is more, it had a practical effect; it moved armies."

H. H. H.

BROWNELL, *W. C., Style,* Scribner's 75:5 and 6, 76:1. May, June, and July, 1924.

A learned dissertation. Solid but sustaining food for thought.

CHRISTIAN CENTURY, 41:17. Editorial, *Is Modern Preaching Too Quiet?*

The answer is "Yes," because we have swung too far in our reaction from rant. The preacher does not even "raise his voice," much less—as he should—"raise the dead."

HOCKING, WILLIAM ERNEST. *Leaders and Led,* Yale Review, 13:4.

An able, perspicuous inquiry into the psychological qualities of successful leadership. One must be a strict disciplinarian, capable of correcting bad habits, and suitable to the will and temper of the people. A brief study of political leadership and its abnormalities attempted. Some interesting comments on conviction and persuasion.

HORWILL, H. W., *The Preacher's Handicap,* Atlantic Monthly, 133: p. 635. May, 1924.

The preacher's handicap is the rest of the church service.

LONDON TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT, No. 480, June 28, 1924. *Oratorical Contests.*

Favorable comment on the recent nation-wide oratorical contest for secondary school students, held in the United States; lament that England is backward in teaching public speaking.

LONDON TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT, No. 486, August 9, 1924. *Diseases of Speech.*

The conventional complaint against mispronunciation and bad grammar. Nothing on speech correction as we understand it.

QUINN, ARTHUR H., *New Notes and Old in the Drama,* Scribner's, 76:1, p. 79. July, 1924.

This thoroughgoing sober review is especially interesting for its encouragement to university and college dramatic clubs, some

of whose original plays are rated higher than the work of many professionals.

VINCENT, ELIZABETH, *Old First Night*, New Republic, 40:512, p. 95. September 24, 1924.

An interesting and informing sketch of the parent Chautauqua, with an estimate of its importance; written on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary.

GENERAL EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS

(Edited by GILES WILKESON GRAY, State University of Iowa)

BAGBY, ENGLISH: The Inferiority Reaction; *Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology*, 18:269 Oct.-Dec. 1823.

BURNHAM, WILLIAM H.: Mental Hygiene and Habits of Thinking; *Pedagogical Seminary*, 30:105, June, 1923.

CLARK, L. P.: Re-educational Treatment for Confirmed Stammerers; *Medical Record*, 101:609, 1922.

CORIAT, ISADOR *H.*: Suggestion as a form of Medical Magic; *Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology*, 18:258, Oct.-Dec. 1923.

DEMOTTE, AMELIA: Language; *American Annals of the Deaf*, 76: 386, Nov. 1922.

ESPER, E. A.: The Psychology of Language; *Psychological Bulletin*, 18:490, 1921.

FARIS, E.: The Psychology of Language; *Psychological Bulletin*, 16:93, 1919.

FLETCHER, H.: The Nature of Speech and its Interpretation; *Jour. Frank. Inst.*, 193-729, 1922.

FROSCHELS, E.: Sprachstörungen und Schule; *Wien. Med. Woch.*, 70:990, 1920.

HERSKOVITS, MELVILLE J.: A Test of the Downey Will-Temperament Test; *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8:75-88, March, 1924.

JONES, C. T.: Survey of Speech Defects; *Training School Bulletin*, 19:93, 1922.

JONES, D.: Analysis of the Mechanism of Speech; *Nature*, 99:285, June 7, 1919.

LILJENKRANTS, JOHAN: Memory Defects in the Organic Psychoses; *Psychological Monographs*, 32: No. 1, Whole Number 143, 1922.

MARTIN, FREDERICK: Stammering: Underlying Causes and Method of Correction; *Medical Record,* 97:914, 1920.

MCCLATCHY, V. R.: Differences in the Oral Response of General and of Local Interest; *Journal of Experimental Psychology,* 5:312, 1922.

Motor Relation of Speech and Idea; *Monist,* 25:315, April 1915.

MURSELL, JAMES L.: Sublimation and the Ideal of Education; *Pedagogical Seminary,* 30:24, March, 1923.

PACINI, J. P.: Stammering; *Medical Record,* 93:800, 1918.

SCHROEDER, T.: Psychoanalysis and Suggestion; *Psychoanalytical Review,* January, 1923.

SCRIPTURE, MAY KIRK, and KITTREDGE, WINIFRED BOYD: An Attempt to Determine another Etiological Factor of Stuttering through Objective Measurement; *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 14:163, March, 1923.

SHAW, E. E.: Some Imaginal Factors Influencing Verbal Expression; *Psychological Monographs,* 26: 1919, No. 113.

SMITH, NILA BANTON: Effectiveness of Practice Tests in Teaching Beginning Reading; *Journal of Educational Research,* 7:213, March 1923.

STARR, HENRY E.: The Hydrogen Ion Concentration of the Mixed Saliva Considered as an Index of Fatigue and of Emotional Excitation, and Applied to a Study of the Metabolic Etiology of Stammering; *American Journal of Psychology,* 33:394, 1922.

WEAVER, ANDREW T.: Experimental Studies in Vocal Expression; *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 8:23-51, March 1924.

FAIRCHILD, HOXIE NEALE: A Short Course in Straight Thinking; *English Journal,* 13:256, April 1924.

ENFIELD, GERTRUDE: Does the Pageant Vitalize Literature? *English Journal,* 13:267, April 1924.

GLUECK, BERNARD: The Concept "Nervous Child;" *American Journal of Psychiatry,* 3:515, January, 1924.

NEWS AND NOTES

NEWS OF THE DEPARTMENTS

Ohio State University's first experience with the open forum style of debating was held April 17, in a debate with Pennsylvania State College on the World Court. There was also a "before and after" ballot of sentiment on the question.

The half hour question and answer period which followed the formal debate was lively and interesting, due partly to the skill and tact of Professor V. A. Ketcham, who presided. Several points, such as the relation of the court to the League of Nations, the relative importance of the cases which have been tried before the court, and the record of the Hague Court of Arbitration, were cleared up.

The most marked effect of the open forum plan on the debaters was a lessening of nervous strain. Speeches on the whole were more natural and less combative than in the old style debates. There was a noticeable tendency to center attention on the facts. It must be said, however, that the customary debating tactics were resorted to by both teams to some extent.

Professor Ketcham, in his opening remarks, made it very clear that the ballot was to be one of sentiment on the question and not on the merits of the debate. However, twelve students, as will be noted below, expressed themselves as "strongly opposed" to the court before the debate, and "strongly favorable" after the debate, thus favoring Ohio State. Otherwise, it is believed that the balloting represented actual changes of sentiment.

The audience expressed its approval of the open forum plan by voting 82 to 9 in favor of holding one such debate every year; but opposed, by a vote of 60 to 25, holding all intercollegiate debates on this plan.

The total number of ballots cast on the question itself was 128. This attendance is less than half the ordinary attendance at Ohio

State debates, but this is not to be attributed to the fact that this was a no-decision debate. Contrary to usual custom, there had been no concerted effort to arouse interest in this debate.

The following analysis of the voting on the question is of interest, particularly in regard to the changes from neutrality to other shades of opinion, and in regard to the lack of change in the opinion of those who were "strongly favorable" at the opening of the debate.

	Before the Debate	After the Debate
1. Strongly opposed	21	16
2. Slightly opposed	15	11
3. Neutral	31	5
4. Slightly favorable	39	37
5. Strongly favorable	22	59

Net reaction: Before the debate: Negative 57, Positive 83.
After the debate: Negative 54, Positive 145.

(This net reaction was determined by computing Neutral as 0, Slightly Favorable as Plus 1, Strongly Favorable as Plus 2, Slightly Opposed as Minus 1, and Strongly Opposed as Minus 2.)

DETAILS OF CHANGES IN SENTIMENT

Of The 21 Strongly Opposed Before The Debate—6 remained strongly opposed; 1 became slightly opposed; 1 became neutral; 1 became slightly favorable; 12 became strongly favorable.

Of The 15 Slightly Opposed Before The Debate—3 became strongly opposed; 4 remained slightly opposed; 1 became neutral; 5 became slightly favorable; 9 became strongly favorable.

Of The 31 Neutral Before The Debate—4 became strongly opposed; 5 became slightly opposed; 1 remained neutral; 12 became slightly favorable; 9 became strongly favorable.

Of The 39 Slightly Favorable Before The Debate—3 became strongly opposed; 1 became slightly opposed; 2 became neutral; 19 remained slightly favorable; 14 became strongly favorable.

Of The 22 Strongly Favorable Before The Debate—22 remained strongly favorable.

W. P. S.

Northwestern University is announcing what should be an interesting one-act play contest, open to undergraduate groups from any college or university. It is hoped that the contest will be an annual affair, with the length of the meeting gradually increased so that a larger number of clubs may appear. Eventually, it is hoped, only original plays may be presented. The prize to be awarded is the "Cumnock Cup," together with a cash award of two

hundred fifty dollars. The contest will be held Wednesday, December 31, 1924, and Thursday, January 1, 1925, at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Regulations governing the contest are as follows:

1. Preliminary contests: Wednesday P. M. and evening, December 31.
   Final contest: Thursday evening, January 1, when the best three will appear for the second time.
2. Preliminary Contest Judges: Five well-known men and women interested in this field to be chosen by the contest committee.
   Final Contest Judges: As above.
3. The decision of the judges will be based upon three considerations: (a) choice of play, (b) direction, (c) acting.
4. The play may be any one-act play which can be presented in a maximum time of 40 minutes. While any play may be selected, no play may be given by two clubs. The right to present any play shall be with the club making the first registration for that play.
5. The cast is not limited as to number.
6. Members of the casts must be undergraduates carrying full work and meeting their local eligibility rules.
7. Not more than six companies may compete. Registrations will be accepted in order until the above quota has been filled.
8. Registrations open October 15 and close November 15, 1924. Address the Chairman, enclose fee, indicate the play to be presented.
9. Registrations must be accompanied by a fee of $20.00. For this fee forty tickets will be sent to each manager, these tickets to be given or sold to Chicago and North Shore Alumni and friends. Fees received will be used to defray expenses of the contest.
10. All plays must be presented before curtains and set pieces furnished by Northwestern University. (Complete and detailed description on request). Additional set pieces (windows, doors, etc.,) may be brought by contesting clubs. All clubs must use regulation type furniture furnished by Northwestern University. All small properties such as special curtains, small ornaments, coverings, knick knacks, etc., may be brought by each club.
11. All details of this contest are in the hands of this committee: Ralph Dennis, Alexander Dean, and Theodore Hinckley of the staff of the School of Speech of Northwestern University.
12. For registration or information address Dean Ralph Dennis, Chairman, Campus, Evanston, Illinois.

The Philadelphia Teachers' Association has recently completed the organization of a dramatic section among its members. This section aims to develop dramatic interests in the schools, both among students and teachers, by providing for competitive presentation of plays, arranging for talks to students, etc. Monthly

meetings are planned, with programs in keeping with the aims of the organization.

The Public Speaking classes of Professor Maynard Daggy, at the State College of Washington, have been studying problems relating to radio. When the Mask and Dagger Chapter of National Collegiate Players of that institution presented "Miss Lulu Bett" in April, the performance was broadcast from KFAE.

In addition to this play, the Department of Speech at Washington State College has presented during the past year: "The Country Cousin", "Everyman", "Mr. Pim Passes By", "Suppressed Desires", "A Bad Case", "Trifles" and "A Full House", concluding with a performance of "Only 38" during the Summer Session.

A. E. Thomas' comedy, "Only 38", was also produced late in the spring by Mask and Wig of Ripon College, Wisconsin, and the College Players of Jamestown College.

Among the dramatic events of the late spring and summer at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, were the following: "Prunella", the "musicomedy" "Yalami", "Arms and the Man", "The Feast of Osiris", and the one-acts "Fourteen", "The Rushlight", "Bimbo, the Pirate" and "The Bronze Idol".

Among the recent productions of the Dramatic Club of the University of Hawaii have been "Mr. Pim Passes By", "Come Out of The Kitchen", and the one-acts "Trimplet" and "Miniken and Maniken."

The beautiful natural amphitheatre near Laramie, Wyoming, was utilized by the University of Wyoming late in the spring, when they presented the semi-historical nature pageant-drama, called "Vedauwoo", which is Arapahoe for Earth-born.

Another interesting report comes from West Chester State Normal, where the faculty members presented an evening of Scenes from Dickens, under the direction of Miss Cora Everett. The program included scenes from Hard Times, Oliver Twist, David

Copperfield, Nicholas Nickleby, Dombey and Son, and Pickwick Papers.

The Cornell University Summer Theatre, which was opened for the first time this summer, had a very successful season. Experienced and graduate members of the Cornell Dramatic Club and members of the summer classes in play production and dramatic interpretation took parts in the plays. The work of the Summer Theatre was under the direction of Professor A. M. Drummond. Three plays were presented each week on Friday and Saturday nights and in order to satisfy the demand there were occasional repeated presentations. Under Professor Drummond's direction, with the assistance of sub-directors and managers from the Cornell Dramatic Club and its graduates, the work of the Summer Theatre will be continued in amplified form next summer.

The plays presented were:

Thursday Evening----------Christopher Morley
The Very Naked Boy----------Stuart Walker
Suppressed Desires--------Susan Glaspell and G. C. Cook
The Marriage Proposal----------Anton Tchekov
The Last Man In----------W. B. Maxwell
Overtones----------Alice Gerstenberg
A Door Must Be Either Opened or Closed---
------Alfred de Musset
Riders to the Sea----------J. M. Synge
Feed the Brute----------George Paston
Ener Young----------Alice Gerstenberg
Solemn Pride----------George Ross Leighton
Joint Owners in Spain----------Alice Brown
Forest Home----------De Elbert Keenan
How Old Is Alice----------I. T. Dessenger
The Soul of a Professor----------Martin Sampson
Arms and the Man----------George Bernard Shaw

The Dramatic Club at the College of the Pacific, San Jose, California, presented "Dear Brutus" late in the spring.

Students in classes in dramatic production at the University of Iowa presented the following plays during the Summer Session: Stevenson's "Treasure Island", Peabody's "The Piper", Shakespeare's "As You Like It", Crothers' "Old Lady 31", Owen Davis' "Robin Hood", and original one-acts. Most of the performances were presented in the Out-Of-Door Theatre. Settings for all pro-

ductions were executed by students in the Stagecraft Shop. Professor E. C. Mabie acted as Director of the University Theatre and the School of Speech for the summer.

The Northern Oratorical League meets at Evanston the first Friday in May, 1925. Following its now annual custom, the Interstate Oratorical Association would hold its annual contest in Evanston on the last Friday in April. It has been suggested that the Interstate postpone its meeting until the week-end of the N. O. L. contest, holding its contest on Saturday night. It now looks as though this would be done, thus bringing together the two oldest organizations of their kind, making it possible for the faculty and undergraduates present to hear the work of twelve universities and colleges and compare the same. Such a meeting would almost be a Mid-West Public Speaking Conference.

The following program is planned for the Speech Section of the November meeting of the Michigan State Teachers' Association in Grand Rapids:

"Some Aims and Ideals in Speech Education", Prof. H. L. Ewbank, Albion College.

"Speech Signs in the Diagnosis of Disease", Dr. William O'Donnell, University of Michigan.

"Muscular Movements of the Tongue", Prof. Muyskens, University of Michigan.

"Does Compulsory Right Handedness Cause Stammering?" Miss Myrtle Harriman, Detroit Speech Department.

Miss Clara Stoddard, of Detroit Speech Department, is State Chairman for the Corrective Speech work of the Association, and Miss Lousene Rousseau, of the Western State Normal at Kalamazoo, is in charge of the Grand Rapids meeting.

The Community Recreation Association at Albion, Michigan, recently conducted a dramatic institute to train leaders for community dramatic projects. Courses in staging, lighting, costuming, and pageantry had an enrollment of about one hundred. A community dramatic organization has been formed embracing a Little Theatre, a play-finding committee, a committee on children's

dramatics, and a general production committee. Mrs. Elizabeth Hanley of New York City directed the Institute, and Professor H. L. Ewbank of Albion College was chairman of the local committee.

PERSONALS

The Summer Session faculty of the Northwestern University School of Speech was considerably augmented by the addition of the following instructors: Professor E. C. Buehler of Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas; Mildred Harter, Head of Auditorium work in the Froebel School, Gary, Indiana; Manley Phelps, Lincoln, Nebraska; Nadine Shepardson, Head of the Department of Speech, Bradley Institute, Peoria, Illinois; and Professor C. C. Cunningham, of the University of Arizona, who has resigned his position there to become director of Public Speaking Department at the State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh, North Carolina.

Among the new instructors at the Northwestern School of Speech for the present year are the following: Manley Phelps, formerly of the Speech Department of the University of Illinois, later associated with Adrian Newens at Lincoln, Nebraska, and recently chautaqua superintendent and lecturer; Clarence Simon, formerly at Northwestern, who has been doing graduate work at the University of Iowa the past year; and Theodore Ballou Hinckley, editor of *The Drama,* who will offer courses in play-writing, modern drama, etc.

Arthur Eustace Morgan, of University College, Exeter, England, gave courses in Shakespeare and Modern Drama at the University of Iowa Summer Session.

J. H. O'Neill, who has been spending a year in Sharon, Massachusetts, studying and writing, has returned to the University of Wisconsin, where he is chairman of the Department of Speech.

Ray K. Immel, of the University of Michigan, has been granted a year's leave of absence, during which time he will act as Dean of the new School of Speech at the University of Southern California.

Lew Sarett, of the Northwestern School of Speech, spent the

summer, as usual, in the wilds, this time in Montana. Mrs. Sarett and Junior accompanied him.

Miss Laura Shaw, of the Speech Department of the Western State Normal at Kalamazoo, Michigan, is spending her sabbatical year in Tokio, Japan.

H. A. Wichelns, formerly of the University of Pittsburg, has accepted the position of Assistant Professor of Public Speaking at Cornell.

Marvin Bauer has left Cornell to become an instructor at Iowa State College.

Raymond Howes is one of the new Speech teachers at the University of Pittsburg.

Lee Hultzen has resigned his position at Cornell to accept an assistant-professorship at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

George Pflaum has accepted an assistant-professorship at the Emporia (Kansas) State Normal School.

W. S. Howell in one of the new instructors in the Speech Department at Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

Carl Bowman, graduate Fellow at Northwestern University, taught in the Summer Session of the State Teachers' College, Emporia, Kansas.

Gerald Marsh, of Carleton College, is a graduate Fellow in Speech at Northwestern University.

Miss Esther Eldredge, Cornell A. B., is teaching English and Public Speaking in the Newark (New York) High School.

Mrs. E. W. Scripture is giving two courses upon Speech Re-Education in the Department of Education of New York University.

Arthur Woehl has accepted an instructorship at Cornell.

Word has been received of the accidental death of Professor George H. Sholts, head of the Dramatic Department at the University of Missouri.

ARCHIBALD EDWARDS TURNER

Archibald Edwards Turner was born in Richmond, Indiana, July 18, 1868. In 1895 he received from the Nebraska Wesleyan University the degrees of A. B. and B. E. The next two years he studied at the Columbia School of Oratory, and was so successful that he won a position on the staff, and taught in this school for two years. In 1899 he was called back to The Nebraska Wesleyan University to head the School of Expression there. In the fall of 1913 he came to the University of Nevada as Instructor in Public Speaking, and steadily advanced to the position of Professor of Oral English.

As a teacher, Professor Turner gave his students more than guidance in the performance of the daily task, more than direction in the search for the truths of literature; he gave the inspiration of his own upstanding manliness and kindly sympathy. He had to an unusual degree unwavering faith in the fundamental goodness of his fellow man, a faith that not infrequently encouraged disheartened students to struggle through hard tasks, overcome their shortcomings, and win ultimate success in their work.

It was this unostentatious faith that made his influence felt wherever he touched the life of the University, and he touched it at many points. As Master of Lincoln Hall he was in close touch with the students. As director of debating and dramatics he prepared the students for their public appearances, a task to which he gave more time and energy than is generally realized. As member of the Student Affairs Committee he aided in the solving of problems of discipline. To all of these tasks he brought a balance, a firmness, a steadiness of vision, and a kindliness, that made his counsel invaluable.

Nor was his influence limited to the campus. In the church, in the Rotary Club, and wherever else he might give unselfish service, he responded freely and with no thought of personal advancement. It is not for his services, however, rich as there were, that he will be remembered. He lives on the campus and throughout the community in the hearts of all who knew him for his loyalty, his simple faith in humanity, his love of truth and justice, his innate kindliness, and all the other qualities that go to make up a Christian gentleman.

H. W. H.

NOTES ON PREPARING COPY
for the
QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

(The work of the editorial staff would be greatly lightened, the appearance of the QUARTERLY improved, and the chance of error lessened, if contributors would submit their material as nearly as possible in shape for immediate publication. To assist them in doing so we note below the principal rules and customs governing our arrangement and set-up. We hope that contributors will peruse them carefully and also observe the set-up of this and previous issues.)

Leading Articles.

1. Ttiles are set in 10 point caps, and centered, with short bar beneath. If possible they should be short, clear and interesting. We have been criticised for long, academic, forbidding titles. One line titles are best.

2. The author's name is set below the title in 8 point caps (on the typewriter make it lower case and double-underline). It should not be in upper corner of page or at end of article. Full name preferred. But in the interest of free and democratic discussion we omit from our pages all reference to academic titles or degrees.

3. The author's affiliation (school or college, or if he is not in school work his home city) is set below his name in 8 point lower case (ordinary lower case on the typewriter), centered, with short bar beneath.

4. No other matter should ordinarily appear at the head of the article. If the article has been read at a convention an asterisk should follow the title and an appropriate foot-note state the fact.

5. Sub-titles, when used, are set in 8 point caps.

6. The text should be double-spaced (typewritten, of course, if humanly possible). It is set normally in 10 point type. For long quoted passages, poems, charts of figures, etc., 8 point is used, and may be indicated in typing by using single space. For divisions of thought larger than paragraphs and for separating inserted quotations extra spacing may be used.

7. Foot-notes (other than those referred to in Rule 4 above) are marked with superior figures and numbered consecutively from the beginning to the end of each article. In the Ms. each foot-note should be inserted immediately following the line in which it is referred to; this saves the editor and the printer work and worry. Foot-notes should be used sparingly. Some are necessary, of course, but too many kill interest.

Forum Letters.

8. Letters to the Forum are given uniform superscription and subscription as in this issue. It will save time if they are originally written to conform.

Book Reviews.

9. Reviews should be short and informative. We want the reviewer's opinion, of course, but we want his reaction to the book rather than a new book on the same subject by the reviewer.

10. Titles are set, first, in italics, running from left margin. Period after title. Then the word "By" in lower case followed by the author's name in small caps. Then the publisher and the date in lower case, and any additional information as to editor, pages, etc. The second and succeeding lines of the citation are indented. An extra space divides the citation from the text of the review.

11. Reviewer's name at the end in small caps, and affiliation in italics.

Periodical Reviews.

12. Author's name first, in small caps, starting at left margin. Title of article next, in italics. Name of publication next, in lower case, with date.

13. Very short reviews, mere mentions, are not usually signed. Longer ones, especially if expressing opinions, are signed with initials of reviewer. Extra space between citation and text of review, as in book reviews.

General.

14. Italics may be indicated in Ms. by underlining, and small caps by double underlining. Type size may be indicated by penciled note in margin. But we use only two sizes in the regular text, 8 and 10 point. (This is 8 point.)

15. In spelling we are conservative; the New English Dictionary is our court of appeal. We recognize esthetic, equipt, etc., as legitimate variant spellings. We particularly dislike thot, tho, and thru.

16. Every reference in the text to the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION or the QUARTERLY JOURNAL is set in caps and small caps (full caps on the typewriter will do, or lower case double-underlined).

BACK NUMBERS—We have frequent calls for back numbers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, especially Volume I, No. 1, and Volume V, Nos. 2 and 3. Several libraries and individuals stand ready to pay a premium for copies of these issues.

DIRECTORY

ALABAMA

Birmingham—Vandiver, Mrs. Jerome A., 2731 Highland Avenue.

ARIZONA

Tucson — Weller, Herbert C., University of Arizona.

ARKANSAS

Conway—Phillips, Mary G., Central College.
Hot Springs—Geschmay, Hannah.
Little Rock — Siegel, Esther, 510 East Capital Avenue.

CALIFORNIA

Berkeley—McLean, Fannie W., 1829 Bancroft Way.
Perstein, Arnold, University of California.
Rowell, Edward Z., 1055 Miller Avenue.
Watkins, Dwight, University of California.
Whitehead, George S., University of California.
Williams, Kenneth L., 1912 Monterey Avenue.
Chula Vista—Lane, F. H., 637 Third Avenue.
Kingsburg — Jillson, Bessie, Union High School.
Long Beach—Hall, Alta B., 769 Cherry Street.
Nattkemper, L. G., 414 East Seventeenth Street.
Rackham, Henrietta, 920 New York Street.
Los Angeles—Fink, Mrs. Georgia S., 1436 South Hobart Boulevard.
Immel, Ray K., University of Southern California.
McGrew, J. Fred, University of California, Southern Branch.
Hugh, Mrs. D. D., Cumnock School of Expression.
Lawton, Mrs. Marie, 4509 Fifth Avenue.
Marsh, Charles A., University of California, Southern Branch.
Stivers, Dr. Charles G., 2417 South Hope Street.
Sturgis, Granville, 8224 De Longpie Avenue.
Modesto—Painter, Margaret, Modesto High School.
Mountain View—Sumibje, H. K.
Oakland—Miller, Mrs. Fanny Ward, Fanny Ward Miller School of Expression.
Sesnon, Father Robert, St. Mary's College.
Pasadena—Reeder, Nell, Williams School for Handicapped Children.
San Diego—Grimm, Augusta, 3829 Georgia Street.
Hammon, Wilbur A., High School.
San Francisco—Berg, Beda, 132 Elsie Street.
Santa Rosa—Fields, Catherine L., 740 Mendocino Avenue.
Stanford University—Bassett, Lee Emerson, Leland Stanford Junior University.
Buckingham, Elizabeth Lee, Leland Stanford Junior University.

COLORADO

Boulder—Ramsdell, Edward T., University of Colorado.
Denver—Bluemel, Dr. C. S., 1401 Race Street.
Daly, Bernadetta M., 1357 Kalamath Street.
Kingsley, Mrs. Perle Shale, University of Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Milford—Myers May E., Lauralton Hall.
Westhaven—Edgar C. Stiles, Union School.
Windsor—Cherry, G. F., Loomis Institute.

DELAWARE

Wilmington—Sharp, Sallie, Sallie Sharp School of Expression.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington—Burrill, Mary, Dunbar High School.

Hedrick, Jennie, Director of Speech Clinic.
Sister Marie Eileen, Catholic Drama League.
Renshaw, Anne T., 1603 Connecticut Avenue.
Taylor, Rev. Germain, Caldwell Hall, Catholic University.

FLORIDA

DeLand—Stover, Irving C., 201 Minnesota Avenue.

GEORGIA

Decatur—Gooch (Miss) Frances A. Agnes Scott College.

IDAHO

Caldwell—Hayman, H. H.
Rexburg—Nelson, Harry, Ricks College.

ILLINOIS

Cairo—Ellias, Edith Rose, 1313 Ohio Street.
Chicago—Blood, Mary A., Columbia College of Expression.
Burtis, Maxine, 4820 Sheridan Road.
Carnes, Mrs. L. C., 642 Bittersweet Street.
Coonrod, Helen L., 4633 Drexel Boulevard.
Dwyer, Martha H., 604 East 50th Place.
Eichelberger, Mrs. M. W., 725 South Shore Drive.
Gilbert, Edna, 1450 Olive Avenue.
Kennedy, Margaret, 4509 Spaulding Street.
Kenyon, Dr. Elmer L., 104 South Michigan Avenue.
Littell, Winifred H., 6019 Kimbark Avenue.
Miner, Maud A., 718 Fine Arts Building.
Nelson, B. G., 5714 Dorchester Avenue.
Pearce, Margaret C., 2629 West 22nd Place.
Perego, Ina, 6105 Woodlawn Avenue.
Rice, Elinor, 6519 Bosworth Avenue.
Wyrick, Martha, 4425 Greenwood Avenue.
Chicago Heights—Stark, Cecil, 50 West 14th Place.
Decatur—Fike, Louise, Decatur High School.
Young, W. E., James Milliken University.
De Kalb—Hensel, Virginia L., Williston Hall.
Evanston—Dennis, Ralph, Northwestern University.
Fry, Dorothea, 811 Clinton Place.
Herring, Mrs. Bertha, 1008 Huiman Street.
Gaylord, Joseph S., Northwestern University.
Lardner, J. L., Northwestern University.
Sarett, Lew R., Northwestern University.
Simon, Clarence T., Northwestern University.
Freeport—Rosemeier, Carolyn, 639 West Lincoln Boulevard.
Galesburg—Barrer, Fern, 737 North Broad Street.
Menser, Clarence L., Knox College.
Shaw, Warren C., Knox College.
Sheets, Roberta D., Lombard College.
Galva—Bergland, Martha.
Glencoe—Vicksell, Lillie E., 595 Slaeridan Road.
Jacksonville—Thompson, Mrs. Perry C., 1124 West College Avenue.
Jerseyville—Porch, Lillian.
Kankakee—Danforth, Beryl E. W.
Risser, Isabel T.
Knoxville—Dennis, Dorothy, St. Mary's School.
Lake Forest—Brooks, George E., Art Institute.
Lisle—Shonka, A. F., St. Procopius, College.
Monmouth—Williams, Ruth M., 924 East Broadway.
Mount Olive—Peck, Ruth Scott.
Naperville—Oliver, Guy E., North Western College.
North Crystal Lake—Welty, Merle A.
Peoria—Martin, Thora L., Bradley Polytechnic Institute.
Robinson—Berry, Franc, 607 West Walnut Street.
Rockford—Borchers, Gladys, Rockford College.
Rock Island—Pearce, Iva C., Augustana College.
Urbana—Woolbert, Charles H., University of Illinois.

Waukegan—McNaughton, Mrs. Geneva P., Waukegan Township High School.
Winnetka—Phillips, Arthur E., 451 East Hill Road.

INDIANA

Bloomington—Karr, Harrison M., Indiana University.
Crawfordsville—Brigance, W. N. Wabash College.
Evansville — Franklin, Mrs. G. Bruce, Evansville College.
Joslin, Rose B., 623 Second Street.
Greencastle—Boyd, Ralph, Delta Tau Delta House.
Gough, H. B., De Pauw University.
Rist, Dorothy, Campus Cottage.
Strain, Mary A.
West, Edna.
Williams, Robert E., De Pauw University.
Yeager, Beulah, 643 East Seminary Street.
Hanover—Bryngelson, Bryng.
Indianapolis—Perkins, Lola I., Manual Training High School.
Tallcott, Rollo Anson, 72 North Ritter Street.
Lafayette—Scott, Preston H., Purdue University.
Lebanon—Doehleman, Mrs. Cora M.
Lyons—Woods, Vera.
Monroe—Ilgenfritz, Elizabeth.
Muncie—Jones, Madge.
Ramsey, Mrs. May L., 720 North Street.
Pavey, Mary C., Indiana State Normal School.
Peru—Daniels, Opal.
Richmond—Trueblood, E. P., Earlham College.
St. Mary in the Woods—Cryan, Mary.
Terre Haute—Ray, Winnifred, 1221 South Ninth Street.
Winamac—Hoover, Marcella.
Wolcottville—Livingstone, Marian.

IOWA

Ames—Fritz, Charles A., Iowa State College.
Raines, Lester, Iowa State College.
Shattuck, Fredrica V., Iowa State College.
Wagner, Russell H., Iowa State College.
Cedar Rapids—Chapin, Florence, High School.
Des Moines—Boyd, Ivan Bloom, 3007 Grand Avenue.
Hansen, Pearl, 2225 Grand Avenue.
Van Tuyle, Mrs. Helen M., Roosevelt High School.
Elliot—Simmons, Ernest, Public Schools.
Fairfield—Hill, Evelyn, Parsons College.
Fayette—Collett, Margaret Jayne, Upper Iowa University.
Grinnell—Ryan, J. P., Grinnell College.
Ida Grove—Vest, Madge.
Independence—Smith, Marion H.
Indianola—Dennis, W. C., Simpson College.
Iowa City—Cable, W. Arthur, University of Iowa.
Gailey, Marjorie, 403 North Linn Street.
Gray, Giles W., University of Iowa.
Jackson, W. J., University of Iowa.
Langworthy, Helen, University of Iowa.
Merry, Glenn N., University of Iowa.
Mills, (Mrs.) Alice McLeod, University of Iowa.
Wood, Harry Thomas, University of Iowa.
Lamoni—Roberts, Forest A., Graceland College.
Le Mars—Smith, Roy M., 501 Second Avenue S. E.
Lu Verne—Skinner, Kate E.
Menlo—Whitaker, Edith B.
New Sharon—Evans, Wanda.
Oskaloosa—Haworth, Donald, Penn College.
Pipin, M. A., Oskaloosa High School.
Paulinna—Cannon, Susan.
Tama—Forsythe, Jennie, 808 Segal Street.

KANSAS

Chanute—Wolf, Ollie, 317 North Highland Avenue.
De Graff—McCraight, V. C.
Emporia—Peterson, Eunice, College of Emporia.
Pflaum, Geo. R. R., 1101 Congress Street.

Hutchinson—O'Connell, William V., 22 E. 14th Street.
Kansas City—Morgan, Howard C., 808 North 17th Street.
Youmans, R. O., Kansas City University.
Lawrence—Gilkinson, Bryan A., University of Kansas.
Lindsborg—Swensson, Annie Theo., 343 North College Street.
Wahlin, Vendla.
Manhattan—Hill, Howard T., Kansas State Agriculture College.
Meade—Curll, Mrs. F. W.
Ottawa—Wenzelmann, Naomi, Ottawa University.
Saffordville—Jones, Martha Pearl.
Saline—Templer, Charles S., 851 Highland Street.
Topeka—Buehler, E. C., Washburn College.
Gordon, Alice, Topeka High School.
Wichita—McBride, Lida, High School.
Wilner, George D., Fairmount College.

KENTUCKY

Berea—Raine, James W., Berea College.
Frankfort—Sower, Anita, 112 Wilkinson Street.
Georgetown—Fisher, G. E., Georgetown College.

LOUISIANA

Baton Rouge—Adams, J. Q., 542 St. Francis Street.
New Orleans—Hanley, Ben, Tulane University.
Oliveira, Amy, 2300 Joseph Street.

MAINE

Brunswick—Davis, W. H., Bowdoin College.
Lewiston—Baird, A. C., Bates College.

MARYLAND

Baltimore—Smith, Bromley, 3021 Huntingdon Avenue.

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst—Garrison, S. L., 125 S. Pleasant Street.
Belmont—Robbins, Samuel D., 40 Centre Avenue.
Boston—Dacey, Theresa A., 27 Townsend Street.
Gunnison, Binney, 301 Pierce Building.
Swift, W. B., Normal School for Speech Correction.
Tripp, W. B., 25 Huntington Avenue.
Cambridge—Winter, I. L., 32 Hubbard Park.
Fall River—Hurley, Margaret, 1335 Robeson Street.
Lowell—Hogan, Helen L., State Normal School.
Medford Hillside—Adams, Mrs. E. P., 36 Emery Street.
Northhampton—Avery, Elizabeth, Smith College.
New Bedford—Blackmer, Gladys, 675 County Street.
South Hadley—Ball, Margaret, Mt. Holyoke College.
Couch, I. C., Mt. Holyoke College.
Stinchfield, Sara M., Mt. Holyoke College.
Tufts College—Maynard, Newell C., 72 Professors Row.
Wellesley—Damon, Mrs. Ruth A., Wellesley College.
Hunt, Mrs. Elizabeth, Wellesley College.
Moses, Edith W., Wellesley College.

MICHIGAN

Albion—Ewbank, H. L., Albion College.
Ann Arbor—Crocker, Lionel, University of Michigan.
Eich, Louis, University of Michigan.
Hollister, R. D. T., University of Michigan.
Layton, Charles R., 439 South Division Street.
Trueblood, Thomas C., University of Michigan.
Battle Creek—Hathaway, John H., 338 West Van Buren Street.
Bronson—Davidson, Sybil, 512 East Chicago Street.
Detroit—Cochran, Dana E., 2233 Pennsylvania Avenue.
Crumpton, Claudia E., 61 Hague Avenue.
Stoddard, Clara B., 3779 Maybury Grand Avenue.
Ecorse—Winn, Margaret H., School Number Three.

Grand Haven—Nisbett, Jean, 912 Sheldon Road.
Grand Rapids—Ball, Miss F. D., Central High School.
Baxter, E. Ray, Grand Rapids Junior College.
Easterbrook, Eudora, Strong Junior High School.
Holland—Nykirk, J. B., Hope College.
Ionia—Reynolds, Flora, 520 North Jefferson Street.
Ironwood—Miller, Lucile.
Kalamazoo—Lahman, Carroll F., Western State Normal School.
Lindblom, Anna E., Western State Normal School.
Rousseau, Lousene G., Western State Normal School.
Van Avery, Frances, 523 Stuart Avenue.
Weiss, N. J., 529 South Park Street.
Mount Clemens—Lockwood, Olive, 31 Miller Street.
Olivet—Hance, Kenneth G.
Youngquist, Edna, Olivet College.
Plymouth—Nuston, Ruth E., 923 Penniman Avenue.
Waldron—Greene, A. L. D.
Ypsilanti—Lathers, J. Stuart, State Normal College.
McKay, F. B., State Normal College.
Stowe, Marion F., 102 North Hamilton Street.

MINNESOTA

Faribault—Sanfield, Adelaide, 18 West 6th Street.
Hibbing—Dumke, Emma Charlotte, Junior College.
Mankato — Constance, Margaret, State Teachers College.
Minneapolis—Edwards, Davis, University of Minnesota.
Garns, John S., 1122 La Salle Avenue.
Sveegen, P. A., 915 26th Avenue.
Northfield—Cochran, I. M., Carleton College.
Kentzler, Ruth P., Carleton College.
Menchhofer, Joseph D., St. Olaf College.
St. Paul—Druch, Mrs. Rae B., 2052 Summit Avenue.
Gallagher, Raymond M., College of St. Thomas.
Morton, Marguerite W., 824 Holly Avenue.
Wright, M. L., Hamline University.
Worthington—Grunstad, Pearl E.
Zumbrota—Bacon, Myrtle C., Zumbrota High School.

MISSISSIPPI

Clarksdale—Rose, Nettie.
Hattiesburg—Gay, J. C.

MISSOURI

Boonville—Marston, Frederick J., Kemper Military School.
Columbia—Morton, Vance M., University of Missouri.
Tisdel, Frederick M., University of Missouri.
Kansas City—Bird, Mary Louise, University Women's Club.
Williams, Nellie E., 3711 East 9th Street.
Kirksville—Wise, C. M., 507 South Davis Street.
St. Joseph—Frick, Agnes, Central High School.
St. Louis—Battle, Anita T., 5656 Kingsbury Blvd.
Dix, Pearl, 4558 Red Bud Avenue.
Grace, Charity, Yeatman High School.
Gregory, Olivia, 3202 Palm Street.
Hultzen, Lee S., Washington University.
McGinnis, Mildred A., 818 South Kingshighway.

MONTANA

Great Falls—Huhn, Vivian, 104 Jensen Apts.
Helena — Roberts, Albert, High School.
Livingston—Weston, Nelle C.
Missoula—Norvelle, L. R., State University of Montana.

NEBRASKA

Bellevue—Puls, Edwin.
Kearney—Morris, Ruby E., 520 West 22nd Street.
University Place—Miller, Enid, Nebraska Wesleyan University.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Hanover—Bradley, Howard A., Dartmouth College.
Brown, Frank E., Dartmouth College.

Utterback, William E., Dartmouth College.
Winan, J. A., Dartmouth College.

NEW JERSEY

Bayonne—Brown, Marguerite L., 38 East 37th Street.
East Orange—Freeman, Alice E., 307 William Street.
Hightstown—Reeves, J. Walter, Peddie Institute.
Jersey City—Creasey, Hannah M., 2600 Boulevard.
Ziegener, Augusta A., 405 Fairmount Avenue.
Newark—Hawkins, Bertha J., 24 Pennington Street.
Thomas, Ruth H., 50 Second Avenue.
New Brunswick—Reager, Richard C., Rutgers University.
Princeton—Covington, Harry F., Princeton University.
Smith, Henry W., Princeton Theological Seminary.
Trenton—Kuhn, Effie Georgina, New Jersey State Normal School.

NEW YORK

Alfred—Mix, Mrs. Arlotta B., Alfred University.
Batavia—Fowler, Christine C., 311 Washington Avenue.
Brooklyn—Alt-Muller, Helen K., Parker Collegiate Institute.
Barber, Sara H., 1208 Pacific Street.
Smith, Eugene, 120 St. Marks Avenue.
Smith, W. Palmer, 401 East 18th Street.
Buffalo—Townsend, Gertrude, 1869 Seneca Street.
Catskill—Luce, Edith M., 285 Main Street.
Cortland—Arnold, Carrie E., 8 North Church Street.
Ithaca—Bauer, Marvin, Cornell University.
Caplan, Harry, Cornell University.
Drummond, Alexander, Cornell University.
Hannah, Robert, Cornell University.
Hunt, Everett Lee, Cornell University.
Muchmore, G. B., Cornell University.
Thomas, C. K., Cornell University.
Wichelns, H. A., Cornell University.
Larchmont—Loeb, Elizabeth V., 163 Murray Avenue.
Kew Gardens, Long Island—Tressler, J. C., 115 Pembroke Place.
New York—Alvicoe, C. M., 43 W. 72nd Street.
Brophy, Daniel F., College of the City of New York.
Brown, May Laird, 1 West 89th Street.
Bullowa, Alma M., 148 East 71st Street.
Collins, G. Rowland, New York University.
Cusack, Annette Lucille, Evander Childs High School.
Daggett, Windsor P., 202 West 74th Street.
Hughes, Nelly W., 130 West 57th Street.
Lewis, Jean, 225 East 53rd Street.
Morris, John S., 113 West 12th Street.
Perkins, Miss Dagmar, 2480 Broadway.
Pray, Sophie A., 2039 Washington Avenue.
Prentiss, Henrietta, Hunter College.
Redmond, D. W., College of the City of New York.
Reeid, N. E., Longmans, Green and Company, Fifth Avenue.
Schamus, John B., 2493 Valentine Avenue.
Scripture, Mrs. Edward W., 20 Fifth Avenue.
Taylor, Harris, 904 Lexington Avenue.
Wells, Emilie J., 134 East 37th Street.
Rome—Swayze, Esther, Rome State School.
Poughkeepsie—Cochran, Mary B., Vassar College.
Steiner, Gretchen H., Vassar College.
Stephens, Lucile, 14 Gray Street.
Syracuse—Bull, Grace, Syracuse University.
Tilroe, H. M., Syracuse University.
Yonkers—Hartley, Alice E., Morris High School.

NORTH CAROLINA

Chapel Hill—McKie, George, University of North Carolina.
High Point—Owens, Henry Grady, High School.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ellensdale—Redfield, Alice A., State Normal and Industrial School.
Grand Forks—Schonberger, E. D., University of North Dakota.
Marion—Sinnot, Bess.

OHIO

Akron — McEbright, Carita, 396 East Market Street.
Parshall, Inez, 50 South Adolph Avenue.
Athens—Cooper, W. H., Ohio University.
Voight, Irma E.
Bellefountaine—Kestle, Allen, 205 East Sandusky Street.
Bellevue—Martin, Elva, 187 Castalia Street.
Bluffton—Steiner, Cyrus.
Cincinnati — Aldrich, Laura E., East High School.
Cairns, Miss H. T., 5673 Overlook Place.
Getzendanner, Jessie, 1330 Yarmouth Avenue.
Nash, Texora, Texora Nash School of Expression.
Van Wye, B. C., University of Cincinnati.
Cleveland — Whitworth, Virginia, 17901 Windward Road.
Woodward, Howard S., Western Reserve University.
Columbus—Ketcham, V. A., 199 Webber Road.
Sandford, W. P., Ohio State University.
Wiley, Karl W., 144 Clinton Heights Avenue.
Yeager, Hayes, Ohio State University.
Crooksville — Coulter, Zeta, 120 North State Street.
Delaware—Hunter, R. C., Ohio Wesleyan University.
Leas, Mrs. Dewitt H., 136 West Winter Street.
McNabb, L. C., Ohio Wesleyan University.
Marshman, J. T., Ohio Wesleyan University.
Miller, Emerson W., Ohio Wesleyan University.
Hiram—Bunn, Russell G., Hiram College.
Lorain—Alcott, Mildred M., 1604 Lexington Avenue.
Hardy, Ruth M., Lorain High School.
Mansfield—Brown, Frederick W.
Mount Vernon—Ringwalt, Ralph Curtis.
Nelsonville — Stalter, Lucille, 259 Fort Street.
New Philadelphia—Glass, Bellie L.
Oberlin—Harbison, C. C., Oberlin College.
Oxford—Flemming, Edwin C., Miami University.
Plain Ctiy—Strickland, Ferel D.
Tiffin—Hopkins, H. D., Heidelberg University.
Shelby—Ferris, Gladys, 43 Raymond Avenue.
Sunbury—Fisher, Verona.
Troy—Jackson, L. E., 307 East Main Street.
Warren—Jones, Julia, 602 East Market Street.
Wilmington—Bangham, Dorothy.
Wooster—Lean, D. G., Wooster College.

OKLAHOMA

McAlester — Munch, Perrill, 519 North Second Street.
Shawnee—Hopkins, A. A.
Stillwater—Anderson, Harry H., 230 Hester Street.
Tonkawa—Chauncey, F. May, University Preparatory School.

OREGON

Corvallis—Barnes, Elizabeth, 135 North 26th Street.
Wells, Earl W., Oregon State College.
Eugene—Todd, Jessie C.
Monmouth—Bodbold, Beth.
Salem—Rahskopf, Horace J., Williamette University.

PENNSYLVANIA

Abington—Wyatt, Mrs. Zaidee Garr, Abington High School.
Bethlehem—Luch, Myron J., Lehigh University.
Bellevue—Howe, Elizabeth P., 21 South Euclid Avenue.
Bloomsburg — Johnston, Alice, Bloomsburg State Normal School.

Bryn Mawr—King, Samuel Arthur, Cartref Cottage.
Nichols, Tirzah L., Elliott and Lancaster Streets.
Bucks County — Landon, Nadia, George School.
Butler—Wiggins, Marian H., 156 Oak Street.
Charleroi—Anderson, Grace, 927 Crest Avenue.
Chester—Doyle, Martha W., 305 East 2nd Street.
Connellsville—Hickman, Elton, 511 South Pittsburgh Street.
Indiana—Strowls, Edna Lee, Pennsylvania State Normal School.
Kane—Moore, Nettie A., 229 Welsh Street.
Latrobe—Carden, Stella L., Latrobe High School.
Meadville—Spalding, Alice Huntington, Allegheny College.
New Wilmington—McConagha, Mrs. Mary Carothers, Westminster College.
Philadelphia — Baxter, Frank C., University of Pennsylvania.
Dolman, John Jr., University of Pennsylvania.
Gerstenlauer, R. D., University of Pennsylvania.
James, Reese, University of Pennsylvania.
McKee, Wilbur K., Drexel Institute.
McKniff, Mary, 1932 South 15th Street.
Stine, Harold S., University of Pennsylvania.
Williamson, A. B. 2300 East York Street.
Pittsburgh—Parrish, W. M., University of Pittsburgh.
Swarthmore — Hayes, John R., Swarthmore College.
Hicks, Phillip M., Swarthmore College.
Pearson, Paul M., Swarthmore College.
Williamsport—Barnet, Miriam R., 715 Elmira Street.
Westtown—Baily, Albert L., Westtown School.
Wilkinsburg—Bell, Alice V., 735 South Avenue.
Minder, Wilder, 1178 South Avenue.
West Chester—Everett Cora E., State Normal School.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville — Buist, Mrs. Ida Robbins, 1026 Pendleton Street.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Aberdeen—Root, A. R., Northern Normal and Industrial School.
Smail, Mrs. W. C., Aberdeen High School.
Armour—Clark, Hazel.
Brookings—McCarty, George, South Dakota State College.
Gayville—Meyer, Mrs. Lilein.
Huron—McGrew, D. R.
Robb, Margaret, 1058 Illinois Avenue.
Max—Amundson, Ebba.
Mitchell—Staehle, Marjorie, 401 East Fifth Avenue..
Veatch, W. H., Wesleyan University.
Rapid City — Johnson, Florence, Rapid City High School.
Vermillion—Lyon, Clarence, University of South Dakota.

TENNESSEE

Chattanooga—Marchbanks, Mrs. S. S., 530 Wyatt Street.
Memphis—Gill, Ella, 1242 Court Avenue.
Schloss, Florence, 472 Poplar Avenue.
Nashville—Harris, Albert Mason, Vanderbilt University.
Woolson, Clara B., Fisk University.

TEXAS

Austin—Griscom, Ellwood, Jr., 706 West 32nd Street.
Mooney, Rev. E. Vincent, St. Edward College.
Schumacher, Matthew, St. Edward's College.
Tomkies, Chas. D., University of Texas.
Dallas — Baker, Elizabeth W., 109 South Denver Street.
Rodgers, Frances G., 3830 Gilbert Avenue.
Denton — Garrison, Coralee, 704 West Hickory Street.
Smith, Justina, State College for Women.

Fort Worth—Glenn, Cora Lee, 1723 5th Avenue.
Georgetown—Wentz, W. Dwight, 1403 Elm Street.
Huntsville—Francis, W. Z., Sam Houston Normal College.
McCauley—Jackson, Mrs. W. C.
San Antonio — Abbott, Frederick, 420 Martin Place.
San Marcos—Sholts, G. H., S. W. T. Normal.
Vernon—Pendleton, Annah Jo.
Waxahchie—Baumgartner, Ira P., Trinity University.

UTAH

Ogden—Beck, Reva Z., 718 25th Street.
Price—Stevenson, Cornelia G.
Salina—Cardon, Grace, North Serier High School.
Salt Lake City — Babcock, Maud May, University of Utah.
Higgs, Aliceile, 647 East Fifth Street.
Houstman, Chauncey, University of Utah.
Maw, Herbert, University of Utah.
Nelson, Miss Nial, University of Utah.
Smith, Joseph F., University of Utah.

VIRGINIA

Lexington—Fulbright, G. S.
University—Paul C. W., University of Virginia.

WASHINGTON

Aberdeen — McDowell, Minnie Moore.
Eatonville—Goehring, Bernice, Eatonville High School.
Pullman — Daggy, Maynard Lee, Washington State College.
Seattle—Grindrod, Ione, 1315 East 47th Street.
Tacoma—Black, Alberta F., Stadium High School.
Kemmer, Edward P., Chamber of Commerce.

WEST VIRGINIA

Fairmont—Opp, Paul F., Fairmont State Normal School.
Morgantown—Kay, Wilbur Jones, University of West Virginia.
Wheeling—Ladd, Hazel E., Wheeling High School.

WISCONSIN

Ashland — Reynolds, Mildred L., Ashland High School.
Beloit—Rassweiler, G. F., Beloit College.
Fon du Lac—Hess, Esther R.
Green Bay—Leavitt, Florence J., West High School.
Kenosha—Haynes, Alice M., 375 Exchange Street.
Kohler—Smith, L. L.
La Crosse—Mashek, Anna M., 1240 Mississippi Avenue.
Madison—Barnes, John, 129 Lathrop Street.
Blanton, Smiley, University of Wisconsin.
Johnson, Gertrude E., University of Wisconsin.
Lounsbury, Helen Irene, 905 Harrison Street.
O'Neil, J. M., University of Wisconsin.
Scott, Almere, University of Wisconsin.
Weaver, A. T., University of Wisconsin.
Welty, M. Lucile, 2321 Rugby Row.
West, Robert, University of Wisconsin.
Menasha—Gachman, Erwin, 327 Tayce Street.
Milwaukee — Anholt, Mrs. Elizabeth, 739 Murray Avenue.
Bott, Katherine, Milwaukee Downer Seminary.
Mills, Katherine, North Division High School.
Ripon—Boody, Henry P., Ripon College.
Sheboygan—Lorenz, Jennie, 1630 North 8th Street.
Wausau—Huss, Olive G., 630 Grant Street.
Krog, Agnes.

WYOMING

Afton—Sounson, L. W.
Laramie—Higgins, H. H., University of Wyoming.
Sheridan—Van Bakoik, Frances.

HAWAII

Honolulu—Appleby, Una, Oahu College.